THE

# LIFE

OF

## THE RIGHT REV. JEREMY TAYLOR, D.D.

LORD BISHOP OF DOWN, CONNOR, AND DROMORE;

WITH

A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF HIS WRITINGS.

BY

REGINALD HEBER, D.D.

LORD BISHOP OF CALCUTTA.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

LONDON

PRINTED FOR JAMES DUNCAN, PATERNOSTER ROW;

AND R. PRIESTLEY, HOLBORN.

1824.

922.7
HERIL
V.2

LONDON:
PRINTED BY J. MOYES, GREVILLE STREET.




THE

# LIFE

OF

# JEREMY TAYLOR, D.D.

ETC. ETC.

THE "Defence of Episcopacy" was followed by his "Apology for authorized and set Forms of Liturgy," which first appeared in 1646, though it was enlarged in a second edition three years afterwards. It is a sufficient proof that he was no time server, when a work of this kind appeared with his name, and with a reprint of his dedication to the king, at a time when that sovereign was already removed to another state of existence.

The work, thus enlarged and improved, is, perhaps, among the best of Taylor's polemical discourses. It was a subject which gave abundant scope to his extensive knowledge of antiquity and of human nature, and it was one above all, which, from its connexion with practical piety, was adapted to call into action much of that higher strain of eloquence by which his practical works are more pecu-

liarly distinguished. On prayer, indeed, he always seems to have felt and written "with all his heart, with all his soul, and with all his strength;" and it is a subject, therefore, on which, of all others, his opinion is most valuable. The most strenuous admirers of extemporaneous prayer can hardly refuse their serious attention to the objections offered against its practice by one who was himself endued with so remarkable gifts both of eloquence and piety. And those whom his arguments fail to convince, or who need no arguments to convince them, will not the less be impressed by the majestic eloquence of his preface, in which he laments over the then persecuted condition of the English church, and, concisely, but with a degree of clearness and elegance which has been seldom surpassed, reviews and regrets the merits of the proscribed liturgy.

"In these things," he says, when comparing the calamities of England to those of Israel, in the days of Hophni and Phineas; "in these things we also have been but too like the sons of Israel; for, when we sinned as greatly, we also have groaned under as great and sad a calamity. For we have not only felt the evils of an intestine war, but God hath smitten us in our spirit, and laid the scene of his judgments especially in religion; he hath snuffed our lamp so near that it is almost extinguished, and the sacred fire was put into a hole of the earth, even then when we were forced to light those tapers that stood upon our

altars, that, by this sad truth better than by the old ceremony, we might prove our succession to those holy men, who were constrained to sing hymns to Christ in dark places and retirements."

"But I delight not to observe the correspondences of such sad accidents, which, as they may happen upon diverse causes, or may be forced violently by the strength of fancy, or driven on by jealousy, and the too fond openings of troubled hearts and afflicted spirits; so they do but help to vex the offending part, and relieve the afflicted but with a fantastic and groundless comfort. I will, therefore, deny leave to my own affections to ease themselves by complaining of others. I shall only crave leave that I may remember Jerusalem, and call to mind the pleasures of the temple, the order of her services, the beauty of her buildings, the sweetness of her songs, the decency of her ministrations, the assiduity and economy of her priests and Levites, the daily sacrifice, and that eternal fire of devotion that went not out by day nor by night: these were the pleasures of our peace, and there is a remanent felicity in the very memory of those spiritual delights which we then enjoyed as antepasts of heaven, and consignations to an immortality of joys. And it may be so again when it shall please God, who hath the hearts of all princes in his hands, and turneth them as the rivers of water; and when men will consider the invaluable loss that is appendant to the destroying

such forms of discipline and devotion in which God was purely worshipped, and the church was edified and the people instructed to great degrees of piety knowledge, and devotion."—"For to the churches of the Roman communion we can say that ours is reformed; to the reformed churches we can say, that ours is orderly and decent: for we were freed from the impositions and lasting errors of a tyrannical spirit, and yet from the extravagancies of a popular spirit too: our reformation was done without tumult, and yet we saw it necessary to reform; we were zealous to cast away the old errors, but our zeal was balanced with consideration and the results of authority. Not like women and children when they are affrighted with fire in their clothes; we shaked off the coal indeed, but not our garments, lest we should have exposed our churches to that nakedness which the excellent men of our sister churches complained to be among themselves*."

The advantages of set forms of prayer in general; the peculiar merits of the English liturgy; the weakness of the objections urged against its different particulars; the testimony borne to its merits by the most celebrated among the martyrs of the Reformation; (among whom he instances, with peculiar respect, the name of his own ancestor, Rowland Taylor;) contrasted with the obvious imperfections

* Preface to Apology, sect. 2, 3—6. Vol. vii. p. 284—286.

and arrogant claims of the recent "Directory," are, all in their turns, concisely and eloquently treated: till he returns again to the excellence and misfortunes of the Common Prayer.

"And yet this excellent book hath had the fate to be cut in pieces with a pen-knife, and thrown into the fire; but it is not consumed. At first, it was sown in tears, and is now watered with tears, yet never was any holy thing drowned and extinguished by tears. It began with the martyrdom of the compilers, and the church hath been vexed ever since by angry spirits, and she was forced to defend it with much trouble and unquietness; but it is to be hoped, that all these storms are sent but to increase the zeal and confidence of the pious sons of the church of England. Indeed, the greatest danger that the Prayer-Book ever had, was the indifferency and indevotion of them that used it but as a common blessing: and they who thought it fit for the meanest of the clergy to read prayers, and for themselves only to preach, though they might innocently intend it, yet did not in that action consult the honour of our liturgy, except where charity or necessity did interpose. But, when excellent things go away, and then look back upon us, as our blessed Saviour did upon St. Peter, we are more moved than by the nearer embraces of a full and actual possession. I pray God it may prove so in our case, and that we may not be too willing to be discouraged; at least,

that we may not cease to love and to desire what is not publicly permitted to our practice and profession*."

In this fine preface there is one passage, which I could wish had been differently worded. In commending, with good reason, the manner in which different passages from the Epistles and Gospels are selected to be read in the Communion Service, he thus expresses himself:—

"If we deny to the people a liberty of reading Scriptures, may they not complain, as Isaac did against the inhabitants of the land, that the Philistines had spoiled his well, and the fountains of living water? If a free use to all of them, and of all Scriptures, were permitted, should not the church herself have more cause to complain of the infinite licentiousness and looseness of interpretations, and of the commencement of ten thousand errors, which would certainly be consequent to such permission? Reason and religion will chide us in the first, reason and experience in the latter. And can the wit of man conceive a better temper and expedient than that such Scriptures only, or principally, should be laid before them all in daily offices, which contain in them all the mysteries of our redemption, and all the rules of good life?"——"And were this design made something more minute, and applicable to the various

* Preface to Apology, sect. 47. p. 311.

necessities of the times, and such choice Scriptures permitted indifferently, which might be matter of necessity and great edification, the people of the church would have no reason to complain that the fountains of our Saviour were stopped from them, by the rulers of the church, that the mysteriousness of Scripture were abused by the petulancy of the people, to consequents harsh, impious, and unreasonable, in despite of government, in exauctoration of the power of superiors, or for the commencement of schisms and heresies."

If, in these words, he means no more than to propose that, for the occasions of the *public* service of the church, and instead of the now almost continuous order in which the Bible is read in our congregations on week-days, a selection were made after the manner of the ancient lectionaries, leaving the entire Bible as free as before to the private studies of all Christians; I do not know that the measure which he recommends would be liable to any serious objections. It has been already adopted, to a certain extent, by the church, in her selection of the proper lessons for Sundays and saints' days throughout the year; and, even in the regular course of the daily chapters, it is well known that the principle, at least, is admitted by the exclusion of some particular passages. But it is not easy to see how a choice of Scriptures for public reading could prevent those which were read in private from being abused

in the manner which he deplores; and, if it were his design to permit the Scriptures to the laity only in such an abridged and garbled form as their spiritual rulers might think advisable, it could only remain for us to regret, that the danger of the times and the bitter fruits of enthusiasm and fanaticism then before his eyes, had so far overpowered the better understanding and better feeling of a man like Taylor, as that they should betray him into a proposal at once so foolish and so blameable, so contrary to the maxims of an enlarged worldly prudence, and so dangerous to genuine Christianity. The strangest circumstance of the whole, and that which induces me still more to think that the author has here spoken inconsiderately, is that, a few sections further on, he expresses an opinion directly contrary to that which he has here advanced, and praises the church of England, in the highest terms, for her orderly, and, (with few exceptions) her *indiscriminate* reading of the Old and New Testament. "Certainly," are his words, "it was a very great wisdom, and a very prudent and religious constitution, so to order that part of the liturgy which the ancients called the 'Lectionarium,' that the Psalter should be read over twelve times in the year, the Old Testament once, and the New Testament thrice, besides the Epistles and Gospels, which renew, with a more frequent repetition, such choice places as represent the entire body of faith and good life. There is a defalcation

of some few chapters from the entire body in the order, but that also was part of the wisdom of the church not to expose to public ears and common judgment some of the secret rites of Moses's law, or the more mysterious prophecies of the New Testament, whose sense and meaning the event will declare, if we, by mistaken and anticipated interpretations, do not obstruct our own capacities, and hinder us from believing the true events, because they answer not those expectations with which our own mistakes have prepared our understandings*."

The treatise itself is occupied in discussing the arguments usually advanced either by those who object to all set and premeditated forms whatever, or by those who admit of a premeditated form, so it be not enjoined by authority, but every minister of the Gospel be left to the best use of those gifts of prayer which he possesses. Against the first of these he urges the counsel of Solomon, "Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thy heart be hasty to utter any thing before God," demanding—"who keeps the precepts best, he that deliberates, or he that considers not when he speaks?"—He proceeds to instance, to the same effect, the example and authority of the wisest nations and most sober persons of antiquity: and examines, with much learning and acuteness, the pretence of a promise in the Gospel of a spirit of prayer, and of a peculiar assistance to our

* Pref. sect. 37. p. 303.

unpremeditated devotions. What he here lays down as to the nature of the ordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost, and those celestial aids which are purchased for us by Christ's blood, is extremely useful and important, inasmuch as he proves "that the aids of the Holy Ghost are only assistances to us in the use of natural means," and that "labour, and hard study, and premeditation, will soonest purchase the gift of prayer, and ascertain us of the assistance of the Spirit." He shews that, even where the extraordinary aids of the Holy Ghost were most largely given, in the case of the inspired writers of the New Testament, "yet, in the midst of those great assistances and motions, they did use study, art, industry, and human abilities."

"This," he proceeds, "is more than probable in the different styles of the several books; some being of admirable art, others lower and plain. The words were their own, at least sometimes, not the Holy Ghost's. And, if Origen, St. Hierome, and especially the Greek fathers, scholiasts and grammarians, were not deceived by false copies, but that they truly did observe sometimes, to be impropriety of an expression in the language, sometimes not true Greek, who will think those errors or imperfections in grammar were, (in respect of the words, I say,) precisely immediate inspirations and dictates of the Holy Ghost, and not rather their own productions of industry and humanity?"

"But, clearly some of their words were the words of Aratus, some of Epimenides, some of Menander, some of St. Paul, [*This speak I, not the Lord.*]"— "And, since that we cannot pretend on any grounds of probability to an inspiration so immediate as theirs, and yet their assistances, which they had from the Spirit, did not exclude human arts and industry, but that the ablest scholar did write the best, much rather is this true in the gifts and assistances we receive, and particularly in the gift of prayer. It is not an extempore and an inspired faculty; but the faculties of nature, and the abilities of art and industry, are improved and ennobled by the supervening assistance of the Holy Spirit. And, if those who pray extempore, say, that the assistance they receive from the Spirit is the inspiration of words and powers, without the operation of art and natural abilities, and human industry; then, besides that it is more than the penmen of Scripture sometimes had, (because they needed no extraordinary assistances to what they could of themselves do upon the stock of other abilities.) Besides this, I say, it must follow that such prayers, so inspired, if they were committed to writing, would form as good canonical Scripture as any is in St. Paul's Epistles: the impudence of which pretension is sufficient to prove the extreme vanity of the challenge *."

"But," (he goes on to argue,) having thus shewn

* Apology, sect. 32. p. 333.

that the gift of praying by the Spirit, whatever it means, may, like all other spiritual gifts, be acquired by human industry,—"Let us take a man that pretends he hath the gift of prayer, and loves to pray extempore. I suppose his thoughts go a little before his tongue. I demand, then, whether cannot this man, when it is once come into his head, hold his tongue, and write down what he hath conceived? If his first conceptions were of God and God's Spirit, then they are so still, even when they are written. Or, is the Spirit departed from him at the sight of a pen and inkhorn? It did use to be otherwise among the old and new prophets, whether they were prophets of prediction or of ordinary ministry. But, if his conception may be written, and, being thus written, is still a production of the Spirit, then it follows, that set forms of prayer, deliberate and prescribed, may as well be a praying with the Spirit as sudden forms and extempore outlets." "So that, in effect, since, after the pretended assistance of the Spirit in our prayers, we may write them down, consider them, *try the Spirits*, and ponder the matter, the reason, and the religion of the address; let the world judge whether this sudden utterance and extempore forms be any thing else but a direct resolution not to consider beforehand what we speak *."

He then examines, with the same clearsighted dis-

* Apol. sect. 31, 35 pp. 335, 336.

crimination, the different meanings in which we may understand the scriptural expression of "praying by the Spirit;" which he defines to be, "first, when the Spirit stirs up our desires to pray, *per motionem actualis auxilii;* or, secondly, when the Spirit teaches us what or how to pray, telling us the matter and manner of our prayers; thirdly and lastly, dictating the very words of our prayers. There is no other way in the world to pray with the Spirit that is pertinent to this question; and of this last manner the Scripture determines nothing, nor speaks any thing expressly of it. And yet, suppose it had, we are certain the Holy Ghost hath supplied us with all these, and yet in set forms of prayer best of all: I mean, where a difference can be.

"For, first: As for the desires and actual motions or incitements to pray, they are indifferent to one or the other, to set forms or extempore.

"Secondly: But as to the matter or manner of prayer, it is clearly contained in the expresses and set forms of Scripture; and there it is supplied to us by the Spirit, for He is the great dictator of it.

"Thirdly: Now, then, for the very words. No man can assure me that the words of his extempore prayer are the words of the Holy Spirit. It is neither reason nor modesty to expect such immediate assistances to so little purpose, he having supplied us with abilities more than enough to express our desires, *aliunde*, otherwise than by immediate dic-

tate. But, if we will take David's Psalter, or the other hymns of Holy Scripture, or any of the prayers which are respersed over the Bible, we are sure enough that they are the words of God's Spirit, mediately or immediately, by way of infusion or ecstacy, by vision, or, at least, by ordinary assistance. And now then, what greater confidence can any man have for the excellency of his prayers, and the probability of their being accepted, than when he prays his Psalter, or the Lord's Prayer, or any other office which he finds consigned in Scripture? When God's Spirit stirs us up to an actual devotion, and then we use the matter he hath described and taught, and the very words which Christ, and Christ's Spirit, and the apostles and other persons full of the Holy Ghost did use; if, in the world, there be any praying with the Spirit, (I mean, in vocal prayer,) this is it*."

In replying to the second objection, which admits of premeditation, but attacks the restriction of all men to a single form, he admits, in the first place, that "the gift or ability of prayer given to the church is used either in public or private, and that which is fit enough for one is inconvenient in the other; and, although a liberty in private may be for edification of good people, when it is piously and discreetly used, yet, in the public, if it were indifferently per-

* Apol. sect. 47, 48, 49. p. 343.

mitted, it would bring infinite inconvenience, and become intolerable." Then, after some intermediate observations, evincing a profound acquaintance with the human heart, and a large personal experience of those seraphic ardours of devotion which, in private, "may descend, like an anointing from above, and which are not to be restrained within the margent of prescribed forms," he urges that such a spirit may nevertheless *keep silence in the church, and speak unto himself and unto God;*" and that, "though public forms cannot be fitted to every man's fancy and affections,"—"yet they may be fitted to all necessities and to every man's duty." That, even if every minister were permitted to pray his own forms, his form could not comply with the great variety of affections which are amongst his auditors: though it might hit casually, and by accident be commensurate to the present fancy of some of his congregation, with which, at that time, possibly the public form would not. "This may be thus, and it may be otherwise; and, at the same time in which some feel a greater gust and relish in his prayer, others might feel a greater sweetness in recitation of the public forms. This thing is so by chance, so singular and uncertain, that no wise man, nor no providence less than Divine, can make any provision for it *."

After all, he urges, it is nothing but the fantastic

* Apol. sect. 51—62. pp. 344, 350.

and the imaginative part that is pleased; and when men, out of fancy, prejudice, or passion, are not edified by that which, in itself, is good, wholesome, and apt to edify, more particularly when this is prepared by those men who, in all reason, are to be supposed to have received from God all those assistances which are effects of the "spirit of government;" "the way to cure the inconvenience is to alter the men, not to change the institution."

Having thus cleared up the question of edification, he proceeds to discuss the points of right and authority. He shews, that the power of appointing certain forms of prayer is, by a necessary analogy, to reside in the rulers of the church; both as stewards of sacred things, and as, like the old prophets, bound to pray for the people, and to provide that so solemn a duty as public prayer be performed without disorder or scandal.

And, as the Presbyterians were agreed with him, that the ministers, and not the people, were to prescribe the words of the prayer in which all should join, he goes on to urge, that the church, in general, might more fitly execute this office for all, than every single minister for his congregation: inasmuch as, whatever promises of spiritual assistance are made to individual believers, are more fully and definitely accorded to the church at large; and, since the church at large, in her collective and corporate capacity, can only exercise whatever spirit

of prayer she may possess in limited and determined forms, no private minister can expect to pray better than a council; few are so confident in themselves as to say, that they can do it as well; and "quod spectat ad omnes, ab omnibus tractari debet."

He proceeds to shew, by the precedents of all former, the form of benediction prescribed by God to Moses; the psalms employed in the service of the Temple; the example of John the Baptist, and of Christ himself, that some set forms of prayer were of inspired and divine authority. He proves the injunction of Christ to extend to the form of words as well as to the purport of the petitions*; and observes, "that if ever any prayer was, or could be, a part of that doctrine of faith by which we received the Spirit, it must needs be this prayer, which was the only form our blessed Master taught the Christian church."

The practice of the ancient church, both in prayers and hymns, restricting both to set forms, and permitting such forms only to be introduced by persons in authority, he next establishes and comments on. He instances some of the advantages of a well-constructed liturgy, in conveying truths to the heart as well as the understanding of the assistants; in preserving concord and catholic communion; and in restraining the conceit and

* Sect. 75—79. pp. 356, 358.

curiosity of individual ministers of religion, whose devotion may be spoiled by the same applauses which encourage and augment their fluency. "But these things," he observes with characteristic moderation and gentleness, "are accidental to the nature of the thing; and, therefore, though they are too certainly consequent to the person, yet I will not be too severe, but preserve myself on the surer side of a charitable construction; which, truly, I desire to keep not only to their persons, whom I much reverence, but also to their actions. But yet I durst not do the same thing even for these last reasons, though I had no other*."

The objection, that individual ministers may as well be left to the composition of their own prayers as their own sermons, he answers by pointing out the many points of difference which exist between the two things; the greater necessity that the people should agree with what they join in than what they hear; the greater reverence required in an immediate address to the Most High; the greater variety and latitude in a theological argument than in a prayer; and the fact, that many persons preach, whom, even in the opinion of the divines of Westminster themselves, it might be as well to restrain from that liberty.

The following passage may lead us to suspect

* Sect. 11-4. p. 379.

that the Presbyterian clergy of those days, had not yet usually begun the practice, which is now almost universal amongst them, of preaching *extempore*, or what passes as such. "Yet, methinks, the argument objected, so far as the extempore men make use of it, if it were turned with the edge the other way, would have more reason in it; and, instead of arguing, "Why should not the same liberty be allowed to their spirit in praying as in preaching?" it were better to substitute this: "If they can pray with the Spirit," why "do they not also preach with the Spirit?" — "Let them make demonstration of their spirit by making excellent sermons extempore; that it may become an experiment of their other faculty, that, after they are tried and approved in this, they may be considered for the other: and, if praying with the Spirit be praying extempore, why shall they not preach extempore too, or else confess they preach without the Spirit, or that they have not the gift of preaching*?"

He concludes by observing, that there is no promise in Scripture, that he who prays extempore shall be heard the better, or assisted at all to such purposes; that this way of prayer is without precedent in antiquity or warrant in Scripture; that it is unreasonable, because without deliberation; innovating, because without authority; detracting

* Sect. 34. p. 385.

from our first reformers, and encouraging to the cavils of the Church of Rome; favourable to the introduction of heresy, and dangerous to the right administration of the sacraments themselves. "He," he proceeds, "that considers all these things, (and many more he may consider,) will find that particular men are not fit to be intrusted to offer in public, with their private spirit, to God, for the people, in such solemnities, in matters of so great concernment; where the honour of God, the benefit of the people, the interest of kingdoms, the being of a church, the unity of minds, the conformity of practice, the truth of persuasion, and the salvation of souls, are so much concerned as they are in the public prayers of a whole national church. An unlearned man is not to be trusted, and a wise man dare not trust himself; he that is ignorant cannot, he that is knowing will not*."

We are now arrived at the "Liberty of Prophesying," introduced by an Epistle to Lord Hatton; from which some passages have been already quoted, and in which he justifies himself from the charge of a latitudinarian indifference to all religions, and recommends to the champions of the faith the use of no other weapons than those which suit the Christian warfare; such as "preaching and disputation, (so that neither of them breed dis-

* Sect. 14, p. 390.

turbance,) charity and sweetness, holiness of life, assiduity of exhortation, the word of God, and prayer."

"For these ways," he continues, "are most natural, most prudent, most peaceable and effectual. Only, let not men be hasty in calling every disliked opinion by the name of heresy; and, when they have resolved that they will call it so, let them use the erring person like a brother, not beat him like a dog, nor convince him with a gibbet, or vex him out of his understanding and persuasions."

As a still further means of obtaining a patient hearing to his arguments, he gives a very short, but very learned and curious sketch of the opinions and practice of the Christian church as to the question of toleration: in which he shews, that persecution was a practice unheard of among Christians, till the church became worldly and corrupted; that it was first used by the Arians and other heretics; and that, when the orthodox began to retaliate, they were condemned for so doing by all the best and wisest of the Fathers. He proves, how comparatively recent, in the Western church, has been the rise of religious persecution; and that, though the Roman pontiffs shewed themselves more encroaching and oppressive than any other prelates, yet no capital punishments were inflicted for heresy till the persecution of the Albigenses at the instigation of the ferocious Dominic. In England more par-

ticularly, (he observes,) though the power of the Pope was no where greater than here, yet there were no executions for matters of opinion, till Henry the Fourth, having usurped the crown, endeavoured, by these bloody sacrifices, to conciliate the priesthood.

All those Christian sovereigns, he urges, who have received from succeeding ages the praise of eminent virtue and wisdom, have been favourable to religious toleration. The blessing of Providence appears, in an especial manner, to have been bestowed on all governments by which it has been maintained; and he gives some remarkable examples of a contrary policy being chastised by foreign invasions, by civil calamities, and by a decay of internal prosperity and national power.

He concludes with expressing his wonder, (though without denying the real guilt and danger of heresy,) that men should shew so much zeal against false opinions, and so little against vicious practices; and that, while thus curiously busy about points of less importance, "they should neglect those glorious precepts of Christianity and holy life which are the glories of our religion, and would enable us to a blessed eternity."

The essay for which he thus endeavours to conciliate a favourable reception, is somewhat less extensive in its object than many have been led to believe, and can by no means lay claim to the

character which has been assigned to it, of a plea for universal toleration. The forbearance which he claims, he claims for those Christians only who unite in the confession of the apostles' creed. Of those sects who refuse their assent to this symbol, (as, indeed, there were none then in existence,) he says absolutely nothing; and the exceptions which he makes to his proposed act of peace, in the thirteenth section, must, in effect, exclude from its benefit, a very large proportion of those who profess religions hostile to Christianity. It is probable, indeed, that, considering the prejudices with which he had to contend, he was not anxious to follow up his own principles to the full extent to which they conducted; and that, in his earnestness to remedy the mutual bitterness of Christian sects, he purposely avoided treating of a case which had not yet arisen, or pleading the cause of those who were in no present or apparent danger of incurring the weight of religious violence.

If, however, he in this respect has taken a view of his subject narrower than he is often supposed to have done, in another respect he extends his principles considerably beyond the limit of a bare abstinence from persecution. He would not only dissuade us from killing or imprisoning our brethren, he would have us unite with them in communion, and he appears to have flattered himself with the hope that the greatest diversity of opinions, on

topics not absolutely essential, might be made to consist not only with general charity but with complete church-union, by the mere non-interference of authority, and by a permission to all Christians to think and preach on such points according to their consciences. It is the authoritative decision, according to him, which, in such differences, occasions the schism, and he appeals to the experience of Christendom for the fact that there are some points of the greatest practical importance, on which the greatest difference of opinion exists, which yet, because men are permitted to differ respecting them, have led to none of those divisions and heart-burnings which have arisen from disputes of far less moment. "It is of greater consequence," he urges, "to believe right in the question of the validity or invalidity of a death-bed repentance, than to believe aught in the question of purgatory; and the consequences of the doctrine of predetermination are of deeper and more material consideration than the products of the belief of the lawfulness or unlawfulness of private masses; and yet these great concernments, where a liberty of prophesying in these questions hath been permitted, hath made no distinct communion, no sects of Christians, and the others have, and so have these too in those places where they have peremptorily been determined on either side."

"For," he shortly afterwards more fully explains

himself, "if it be evinced that one heaven shall hold men of differing opinions,—if the unity of faith be not destroyed by that which men call differing religions, and if an unity of Christian charity be the duty of us all even towards persons that are not persuaded of every proposition we believe, then I would fain know to what purpose are all those stirs and great noises in Christendom; those names of faction, the several names of churches not distinguished by the division of kingdoms, *ut ecclesia sequatur imperium*, which was the primitive rule and canon, but distinguished by names of sects and men? These are all become instruments of hatred; thence come schisms and parting of communions, and then persecutions, and then wars and rebellion, and then the dissolutions of all friendships and societies. All these mischiefs proceed, not from this, that men are not of one mind (for that is neither necessary nor possible), but that every opinion is made an article of faith, every article is the ground of a quarrel, every quarrel makes a faction, every faction is zealous, and all zeal pretends for God, and whatever is for God cannot be too much. We by this time are come to that pass, we think we love not God except we hate our brother, and we have not the virtue of religion unless we persecute all religions but our own; for lukewarmness is so odious to God and man, that we, proceeding furiously upon these

mistakes, by supposing we preserve the body we destroy the soul of religion, or by being zealous for faith, or, which is all one, for that which we mistake for faith, we are cold in charity, and so lose the reward of both*."

In pursuit of this great scheme of general union, he begins by proving that "the duty of faith is completed in believing the articles of the apostles' creed," the composition of which, (with the exception of the article of Christ's descent into hell), he ascribes to the apostles themselves, or to apostolical men in the first ages of Christianity; and which, as it contains nothing superfluous or which does not relate to those truths "which directly constitute the parts and work of our redemption," so must it have been necessarily esteemed sufficiently minute by its composers, and by that primitive church which adopted it, as "the characteristic note of a Christian from a heretic, or a Jew, or an infidel." He admits, indeed, that it is neither unlawful nor unsafe for any of the rulers of the church, or any other competent judge, to extend his *own* creed to any further propositions which he may deduce from any of the articles of the apostles' creed. But he denies that any such deduction or exposition (unless it be such a thing as is at first evident to all), is fit to be pressed *on others* as an article

* Lib. Proph. Introduction, vol. vii. p. 440.

of faith, or can "bind a person of a differing persuasion to subscribe under pain of losing his faith or being a heretic." "For," he urges, "it is a demonstration that nothing can be necessary to be believed, under pain of damnation, but such propositions of which it is certain that God hath spoken and taught them to us, and of which it is certain that this is their sense and purpose. For, if the sense be uncertain, we can no more be obliged to believe it in a certain sense, than we are to believe it at all, if it were not certain that God delivered it. But, if it be only certain that God spake it, and not certain to what sense, our faith of it is to be as indeterminate as its sense, and it can be no other in the nature of the thing, nor is it consonant to God's justice to believe of him that he can or will require more." And he concludes the section with a quotation from Tertullian, that, if the integrity and unity of this rule of faith be preserved, "in all other things men may take a liberty of enlarging their knowledges and prophesyings, according as they are assisted by the grace of God*."

This position he illustrates and enforces in the following sections:—1st; by the moderation shewn in the primitive church to such erroneous opinions as related not immediately to the fundamentals of

* Ubi supra, p. 455.

Christianity; and were maintained by their professors in sincerity and piety: — 2nd; from the utter impossibility of obtaining any certain and universal rule of faith which shall be more definite and minute than the apostles' creed, either from Scripture, tradition, the decisions of councils, the dicta of the ancient fathers, the authority of the Pope, or the opinion of the church universal. He thus arrives at the conclusion that, no man or body of men being competent to judge for others in matters of faith, every man must judge for himself, and according to the dictates of his own reason, either by choosing what guides or teachers he will follow, (which he admits in some cases to be the wisest and in all the easiest course,) or by choosing for himself his opinions in detail, and following his guides no further than his reason agrees with their dictation. That such a course is liable to error he admits; but he contends that such error, whether arising from confusion of understanding, or honest prejudice, or any cause but such wicked and interested notions as cannot sway a pious person, is, in a pious person, innocent before God; "who is so pitiful to our crimes that he pardons many *de toto et integro*, in all makes abatement for the violence of temptation and the surprisal and invasion of our faculties, and therefore much less will demand of us an account of our weaknesses."

Having reached this point in his argument, he

proceeds, by a natural transition, to shew the folly and wickedness of punishing, by death or other severities, the exercise of that choice which he has shewn to be in itself legitimate; a folly and wickedness which he further illustrates by the danger which exists that the same weapon which is employed to extirpate error, may, in some instances, be turned to the injury of truth; by the inefficacy of force in matters of opinion; by the manner in which a resort to such measures derogates from the honour of the Christian religion, and by the fact that God alone has power over the soul of man, "so as to command a persuasion or to judge a disagreeing." He shews, more at length than in his Dedication, how strongly the stream of precedent and ecclesiastical antiquity sets against persecution; and defines, with admirable accuracy and clearness, the limit and nature of *ecclesiastical censure*, and the single species of severity (excommunication) which, even in cases of the most notorious heresy, the church has the power of exercising.

But even this mild and moderate, and altogether spiritual jurisdiction, can only, he repeats, be exercised to remedy practical inconveniences, or to reprove such opinions as, by the rules which he had previously laid down, are formal heresies. "The peace of the church and the unity of her doctrine is best conserved when it is judged by the proportion it hath to that rule of unity which the apostles

gave, that is, the creed, for articles of mere belief, and the precepts of Jesus Christ and the practical rules of piety, which are most plain and easy, and without controversy, set down in the gospels and writings of the apostles. But to multiply articles, and adopt them into the family of the faith, and to require assent to such articles which (as St. Paul's phrase is) are of doubtful disputation, equal to the assent which we give to matters of faith, is to build a tower upon the top of a bulrush; and the further the effects of such proceedings does extend, the worse they are. The very making such a law is unreasonable. The inflicting spiritual censures upon them that cannot do so much violence to their understanding as to obey it, is unjust and ineffectual; but to punish the person with death, or with corporeal infliction, indeed it is effectual, but it is, therefore, tyrannical."

Having thus limited the ecclesiastical authority in matters of religion, the author proceeds to the secular governor, whom he shews to be bound in conscience to tolerate all religious *opinions*, because an opinion is in no point of view subject to his jurisdiction; and to be bound no less, both in conscience and policy, to suffer men to teach and profess any system of Christianity which they themselves believe, so long as the public peace is not broken nor endangered, either by the evident tendency of the doctrines themselves, or the manner

in which their supporters endeavour to disseminate them. And he cautions him with much earnestness, before he has recourse to any measures of severity, not to "call every redargution or modest discovery of established error by the name of disturbance of the peace;" not to be himself the first to break the peace by peevishness and impatience of contradiction; to remember always the gentle spirit of Christianity and the natural claim which all men have to liberty of conscience: and to remember, above all, the saying of Thuanus, "*Hæretici qui, pace data, factionibus scinduntur, persecutione uniuntur contra regem.*"

"The sum," he concludes this section by observing, "is this. It concerns the duty of a prince, because it concerns the honour of God, that all vices and every part of ill-life be discountenanced and restrained; and, therefore, in relation to that, opinions are to be dealt with. For the understanding being to direct the will, and opinions to guide our practices, they are considerable only as they teach impiety and vice, if they either dishonour God or disobey him. Now all such doctrines are to be condemned; but, for the persons preaching such doctrines, if they neither justify nor approve the pretended consequences which are certainly impious, they are to be separated from that consideration. But, if they know such consequences and allow them, or if they do not stay till the

doctrines produce impiety, but take sin before-hand, and manage them impiously in any sense; or if either themselves or their doctrines do, really and without colour or feigned pretext, disturb the public peace and just interests, they are not to be suffered. In all other cases it is not only lawful to permit them, but it is also necessary that princes and all in authority should not persecute discrepant opinions. And, in such cases wherein persons, not otherwise incompetent, are bound to reprove an error, (as they are in many), in all these, if the prince makes restraint, he hinders men from doing their duty, and from obeying the laws of Jesus Christ*."

The following sections are taken up with the practical application of these principles to the then prevailing dissensions among Christians, with an ingenious and candid apology for the errors of the two sects who were, in Taylor's time, most obnoxious, the Anabaptists and the Papists, and with a brief conclusion that churches ought to allow communion to all who agree with them in essentials, and that it is the duty of private Christians to communicate with the national church where that church requires no unlawful conditions of communion. From this he takes occasion again to remark on the danger and impropriety of driving

* Sect. 16. vol. viii p. 144.

men into schism by multiplying symbols and subscriptions, and contracting the bounds of communion, and the still greater wickedness of regarding all discrepant opinions as damnable in the life to come, and, in the present, capital. "It concerns all persons to see that they do their best to find out truth, and, if they do, it is certain that, let the error be never so damnable, they shall escape the error, or the misery of being damned for it. And, if God will not be angry at men for being invincibly deceived, why should men be angry one at another? For he that is most displeased at another man's error, may also be tempted in his own will, and as much deceived in his understanding. For, if he may fail in what he can choose, he may also fail in what he cannot choose; his understanding is no more secured than his will, nor his faith more than his obedience. It is his own fault if he offends God in either; but whatsoever is not to be avoided, as errors, which are incident sometimes even to the best and most inquisitive of men, are not offences against God, and therefore not to be punished or restrained by men; but all such opinions in which the public interests of the commonwealth, and the foundation of faith and a good life, are not concerned, are to be permitted freely. *Quisque abundet in sensu suo*, was the doctrine of St. Paul, and that is argument and conclusion too: and they were excellent words

which St. Ambrose said in attestation of this great truth, *Nec imperiale est, libertatem dicendi negare, nec sacerdotale id quod sentias non dicere.*"

He concludes his treatise with the celebrated story of Abraham and the idolatrous traveller, which Franklin, with some little variation, gave to Lord Kaimes as a "Jewish Parable on Persecution," and which this last-named author published in his "Sketches of the History of Man." A charge of plagiarism has, on this account, been raised against Franklin; though he cannot be proved to have given it to Lord Kaimes as his own composition, or under any other character than that in which Taylor had previously published it; that, namely, of an elegant fable by an uncertain author which had accidentally fallen under his notice. It is even possible, as has been observed by a writer in the Edinburgh Review *, that he may have met with it in some magazine without Taylor's name. But, it has been unfortunate for him that his correspondent evidently appears to have regarded it as his composition; that it has been published as such in all the editions of Franklin's collected works; and that, with all Franklin's abilities and amiable qualities, there was a degree of quackery in his character which, in this instance as well as in that of his professional epitaph on himself, has made the imputa-

* Edinburgh Review, Sept. 1816.

tion of such a theft more readily received against him, than it would have been against most other men of equal eminence.

Whether Taylor himself really found this story where he professes to have done it, has been long a matter of suspicion. Contrary to his general custom, he gives no reference to his authority in the margin; and, as the works of the most celebrated Rabbins had been searched for the passage in vain, it has been supposed that he had ascribed to these authors a story of his own invention, in order to introduce with a better grace an apt illustration of his moral. My learned friend Mr. Oxlee, whose intimate and extensive acquaintance with Talmudic and Cabbalistic learning is inferior to few of the most renowned Jewish doctors themselves, has, at length, discovered the probable source from which Taylor may have taken this beautiful apologue, in the Epistle Dedicatory prefixed to the translation of a Jewish work by George Gentius, who quotes it, however, not from a Hebrew writer, but from the Persian poet Saadi. The story is, in fact, found, word for word, in the Bostàn of this last writer, as appears by a literal translation which I have received from the kindness of Lord Teignmouth. The work of Gentius appeared in 1651, a circumstance which accounts for the fact that the parable is introduced in the second, not the first edition of the Liberty of Prophesying. That Taylor ascribes it to "the Jews'

books," may be accounted for from his quoting at second-hand, and from the nature of the work where he found it*.

On a work so rich in intellect, so renowned for charity; which contending sects have rivalled each other in approving, and which was the first, perhaps, since the earliest days of Christianity, to teach those among whom differences were inevitable, the art of differing harmlessly, it would be almost impertinent to enlarge in commendation. A more useful, though by far more difficult task, will be to discriminate between these general excellencies, and those points in which the author may be thought to have extended his principles too far, or to have fallen short, in his conclusions, of that universal charity to which his principles naturally conducted him.

The leading position of his discourse, as it relates to the terms of communion, or those articles, a faith in which is sufficient to entitle us when alive to the sacraments of the church, and, in another world, to the mercies of our Redeemer, he may be said to have incontestably established; and by so doing to have lent a full confirmation to the principles and practice of the Church of England, who neither in baptism nor in the Lord's supper, requires more from any of her members than a confession of the apostles' creed, and a promise to keep God's commandments. But,

* Note (XX.)

the question becomes much more difficult, if, as Taylor seems to have meant, and as is implied in the very title of his discourse, we extend this same principle to the admission of persons into the public ministry. That office, as it cannot be exercised by all, in its very nature supposes a selection of some and rejection of others; and it is not only natural but allowable, and, generally speaking, a duty in the selectors, to fix on such persons as, being otherwise properly qualified, entertain not only on the essentials of religion, but on its important and practical, though possibly its subordinate features, what the *Antistites Religionis* themselves conceive to be the true opinion. Where a limited number only is to be admitted, this preference given to some need be considered as no reflection either on the morals or the Christianity of the rest. A man may be fit for heaven himself, whom we do not reckon fit for the office of guiding others thither by his public doctrine; and, whether this unfitness arise from defective abilities, defective temper, defective learning, or erroneous opinions,—there is no necessary oppression or intolerance in requesting him to keep silence in the church, or forbidding him to disturb the weak, and encourage the factious, by the circulation of tenets at which the majority of his brethren are offended.

It is by no means enough to object to such a line of procedure, that the points on which we require conformity in our candidates for orders, are such as

the apostles and their immediate successors passed over in silence. If it could be proved, (which it cannot,) that a confession of the symbol known by their name was all which the apostles required in their deacons and presbyters, it would not follow but that, as false doctrines arose in the church, it might become necessary to guard against their dissemination. But in the instance which he mentions of the question which arose concerning circumcision, he appears to have misunderstood the sacred writers, and the obvious purport of that sentence which was given in the council of Jerusalem. The point to be determined on that occasion was, not whether the *Christians of the Jewish nation* were to cease from circumcising their children, or from the observation of the ceremonial laws of Moses. There is no reason from Scripture to suppose that such a change as this was, in the first instance, contemplated by either party. The uniform practice, both of the apostles themselves and their immediate followers, had been, and was, through life, to "walk orderly and keep the law*:" and, however they may have held out to both Jews and Gentiles the fact that the "curse of the law was removed," and that the religious obligation to observe the Mosaic types had expired when those types were fulfilled, they seem to have been anxious not to press the abandonment of customs

* Acts, xxi. 24.

which, in themselves, were innocent, and, from their antiquity and divine appointment, venerable; but to leave the abolition of such unnecessary badges of distinction to the hand of time, and to the changes introduced by Providence. Accordingly, the sentence which St. Peter proposed, and which St. James, by the common consent of the apostles, promulgated, was, that the Gentiles should not be compelled to circumcise their children, not that the Jews should be restrained from doing so*; and the several bishops of the Jewish nation, who successively presided over the church of Jerusalem, till the time of Adrian, in retaining the practice of circumcision, did no more than exercise a discretion which the apostles had exercised before them, and which the Holy Ghost had no where forbidden.

It is no wonder, then, that those Jewish Christians who adhered to the customs of their fathers, were, notwithstanding this distinction, accounted a sound and orthodox part of the Catholic church. The wonder would have been, had they received a different treatment. But a very different treatment those persons did receive who, not content with retaining the yoke of the law themselves, sought also to impose it on the Gentile converts. The most careless reader of St. Paul's Epistles must observe this distinction; and that of such teachers he himself

* Acts, xv. 19, 20.

expressly says, that "their mouths must be stopped*." But, if a Christian teacher may be silenced by authority for promulgating a doctrine which, as Taylor himself would have admitted, is not expressly contradicted in the apostles' creed, nor manifestly contrary to good morals; *a fortiori*, a candidate for the office of teacher may be repelled if he avows that doctrine. So that we have here a death-blow given to that entire and unrestrained liberty of prophesying which Taylor seems to call for, and the question of what doctrine shall be publicly taught in the church devolves again on those ecclesiastical rulers, to whom is subject the spirit, not of preaching only, but of prophecy†."

But if, in such cases, a further rule is allowed besides the apostles' creed and its self-evident consequences, the question will arise, by whom that rule is to be settled. Shall each individual bishop, each separate presbytery, have a rule of their own, and, according to their several views of Christian truth and of doctrines essentially necessary or otherwise, repel the candidate and silence the preacher? Or, would not this give rise to an uncertainty and variation of the test required, far more oppressive to those subject to it, and far more injurious to the general peace and edification of the church, than any thing which subsists in Christian churches as they are now constituted? And is it not far better to act

* Titus, i. 2. † 1 Cor. xiv. 32.

as all Christian churches have acted, in giving to the world, beforehand, a public and general exposition of the leading doctrines which they profess to teach; with which they require a conformity in those who seek for admission to the office of public instructor; and which shall neither be added to by the meddling preciseness, or detracted from by the injudicious laxity of any single ecclesiastical governor?

That there is, in all such confessions, a danger, and a great one, (since what human institution is exempt from abuse?) of attempting to define what God's Spirit has left undetermined, and of laying an equal stress on the essentials and circumstantials of Christianity, is what the advocate of tests is by no means called on to deny. But that is no sound logic which reasons from the abuse of a thing against its temperate use; and the evil, where it exists, is a question of detail, not of principle, and to be remedied, not by an abolition of tests in general, but by a reformation of the particular test complained of. And, to promote such reformation, and to escape such dangers, no considerations can be better adapted than those which Taylor has himself suggested at the beginning of his concluding section.

It is, however, necessary to observe, that the power which is here claimed for each Christian church, of excluding from its public ministry the teachers of erroneous doctrines, is claimed for the church only in its spiritual capacity, and that it has no reference

to those who are without its pale, and involves in itself no civil pains or penalties whatever. Such penalties, it cannot be too constantly borne in mind, the church of Him, whose kingdom was not of this world, has no power or title to inflict; and for the civil ruler to inflict them on religious grounds, Taylor has clearly shewn to be at once an intrusion, a tyranny, and an absurdity.

If, indeed, Taylor may be thought, in his zeal for the liberty of prophesying, to have made it too completely independent of ecclesiastical control, he may be said, on the other hand, to have been too bounded and cautious in his views of civil toleration, when he gives a general power to the civil ruler to repress or punish whatever he may be taught to consider as blasphemy, or open idolatry *.

The first of these crimes, if not very accurately defined, might involve within its net very many descriptions of persons whom Taylor would have been sorry to behold the victims of religious severities. The Deist and the Jew, who maintain Christ to be an impostor, unquestionably blaspheme the Divine Teacher of Christians; the modern Unitarian, who maintains him to be a mere man of men, the Son of Joseph, as surely detracts from the dignity of that Person whom the majority of Christians adore, and, by departing from the apostles' creed, has completely excluded himself from its protection; and, if known

* Sect. xiii. 1, 2; vol. viii. p. 117.

idolatry may be repressed by violence, or punished by the sword, we justify at once all the odious severities of the Spaniards and the Portuguese towards their heathen subjects, if we do not involve in the same snare our fellow Christians of the Greek and Roman communions.

It is probable, indeed, as none of these persons were, at that time, in any immediate danger of persecution, (since for the case of the Roman Catholics he afterwards provided, and the Socinians had not as yet advanced to their modern pitch of free thinking,) that Taylor was not anxious to pursue his own principles to an extent which might give offence to those whom he desired to conciliate. It is certain, that his arguments against punishing men for following the dictates of an erroneous conscience, as well as that which is taken from the dishonour done to Christianity, by supposing it to need any other defence than those weapons of argument and good life by which it subdued the world, are no less cogent against all persecution whatever, than against that which has for its subject the minor dissensions of Christendom.

Nor is there any real weight in the difficulty which appears to have perplexed him, in what manner to reconcile the duty incumbent on every magistrate to repress all open acts of sin and impiety, with the toleration which the same magistrate may be called on to grant to the worshippers of idols, or to the

assailant of Christianity. That difficulty arises from a misapprehension of the magistrate's power, whose office, as it is purely civil and secular, has no direct concern with the souls of men, and who is neither bound nor authorized to interfere between man and his Maker, or to take on himself the punishment of offences against God, except where those offences disturb the temporal peace, or endanger the temporal property of the subject.

Thus, as idolatry, abstractedly considered, is a crime against God, and not against man, it is a crime, the punishment of which God may be conceived to have reserved to himself, and which the secular prince is not called on to punish, or to repress any otherwise than by his own example, and by securing to his subjects the means of religious instruction. Nor can the precedent of the Jewish law avail to lead us to a different conclusion; since, that which might be expedient and necessary under the peculiar circumstances of their theocracy, is no example for us who live under dispensations entirely different; and since, though God may be conceived, as He did in this instance, to delegate a part of his power to a particular magistrate, yet other magistrates, who have no such express commission or direct command, would be guilty of usurpation no less than cruelty, if they presumed to determine on the conduct of "another man's servant."

But, if the particular species of idolatry com-

plained of be attended with obscene or cruel rites; or, if the public processions or ostentatious sacrifices of its votaries have an evident tendency to shock the feelings of the majority of their fellow-citizens, and disturb the public tranquillity, the magistrate is not only permitted, but obliged in conscience to punish or restrain them according to his power, and in such measure as the interests of the community under his charge may require.

Thus the Persians did ill under Xerxes, in destroying the Grecian temples, because not only has a foreign power no right to interfere in the national religion of any state, but because the idolatry of Greece involved no practices, that we know of, inconsistent with the general peace of society. But the Roman senate did well, in repressing and punishing the Bacchanalians, because they had sufficient evidence of the debauchery and violence with which those infernal rites were celebrated. Nor is it useless to observe, that the picture which is handed down to us of the open whoredom and human sacrifices with which the gods of the Canaanites were worshipped, would be, in itself, and without any divine injunction, a good reason why Moses should have prohibited, under the severest penalties, the practice among his own people of such forms of pollution and bloodshed.

In like manner, though it would, indeed, be the height of wickedness and folly, to forbid the Hindoos,

in their own country, to address their devotions to whatever idols, and in whatever form they pleased; yet, if certain Hindoos resident in London were to institute a public procession in honour of Juggernaut, it would be no persecution to command them to perform their acts of faith in private; while, if in the course of those acts any thing actually criminal took place, it would not be the less an offence against the laws, and punishable by the hand of justice, however it might have arisen from the dictates of a real or pretended superstition. Nor, whatever religious prejudice might be pleaded, did our Indian government do wrong in forbidding the murder of female children, nor would it do wrong, (however a real or mistaken policy may forbid the measure,) in preventing the sacrifice of widows on the funeral piles of their husbands.

The distinction which has been laid down as to *actions*, will apply with equal accuracy to *doctrines*. Those which are immediately, or in their evident and avowed consequences, injurious to civil society, and those only, are fit subjects for suppression and punishment; and they are so, not because they are offences against God, but because they are dangerous to mankind. Thus, if a man maintains in argument the falsehood of the Apostles' Creed, he is, perhaps, a blasphemer, certainly an infidel or a heretic; but his crime is not one which it belongs to the magistrate to punish. But the man who persuades his neigh-

bours to insurrection, murder, incest, a promiscuous intercourse of the sexes, or the invasion of private property; the preacher of atheism, who lays the axe to the root of all moral obligation, and the impugner of a future state of retribution, who deprives morality of its only effectual sanction,—such men as these, being common enemies to the peace of the world, are to be put down and repressed by whatever severities are necessary to abate the nuisance. With these exceptions, I know no limit to the toleration of speculative opinions. It is true, indeed, that the teacher of any opinion, false or true, who seeks to inflame in his cause the bad passions of the multitude; who violates the decency due even to established error, and who assails not only the opinions but the characters and motives of those opposed to him; will, under all circumstances, be deserving of general indignation, and, under particular circumstances, may be a proper subject of legal coercion. But this is as a breaker of the public peace, not as an enemy to that religion, which, as it is founded on argument alone, can, by argument alone, be legitimately or effectually defended. The length of this digression will, I trust, be pardoned, on account of the importance of the interests which its subject involves, and the necessity which there appeared of defining more clearly what Taylor had left uncertain. On the beauty of particular passages in the "Liberty of Prophesying,"—on its general eloquence

and clearness of reasoning, as well as on the admirable temper and moderation which throughout distinguish it, any further observations are needless.

"The Doctrine of Repentance," or "Unum Necessarium," is introduced by two letters dedicatory; the first to Lord Carbery, the second, which also is the preface, inscribed to Duppa, Bishop of Sarum, and Warner of Rochester, as well as to the general body of the English clergy.

In the first of these he apologizes for his so constant recurrence to the inculcation of repentance, by the necessity which there was of counteracting the devices which men had found out to excuse themselves from this necessary labour. In the second, he describes his work as suggested by the many false principles and dangerous errors respecting a death-bed repentance, venial sins, and sins of infirmity;—contrition and attrition;—confession, penance, and absolution, which (during his preparatory studies in order to his great undertaking on the "Rule of Conscience,") he had met with in the works of preceding casuists. "It was in vain," he tells us, "to dispute concerning a single case whether it were lawful or no, when, by the general discoursings of men, it might be permitted to live in states of sin without danger or reproof, as to the final event of souls. I thought it, therefore, necessary, by way of address and preparation to the publication of the particulars, that it should appear to be necessary for a man to

live a holy life; and that it could be of concern to him to inquire into the very minutes of his conscience: for if it be no matter how men live, and if the hope of heaven can stand well with a wicked life, there is nothing in the world more unnecessary than to inquire after cases of conscience. And, if it be sufficient for a man, at the last, to cry out for pardon for having all his life-time neither regarded laws nor conscience, certainly they have found out a better compendium of religion, and need not be troubled with variety of rules and cautions of carefulness and a lasting holiness; nor think concerning any action or state of life, whether it be lawful or not lawful; for it is all one whether it be or no, since neither one nor the other will easily change the event of things."

To illustrate his meaning more fully, he goes on to suppose a person in known habits of sin, fortifying himself against the rebukes of conscience by the topics of comfort usually suggested either by those who extenuate their personal faults by ascribing them to the infirmity of nature, or by those who rely on the chance of a death-bed repentance, and on that "attrition," or terror of God's judgments against sin, which the approach of death and the clamours of conscience may reasonably be expected to generate.

In this, in a tone of lofty sarcasm, he instances what he esteems the dangerous encouragements held out to sin by those who have been more careful of

the sinner's ease than his soul; and, after a digression to which I shall hereafter have occasion to refer, he exhorts the clergy to employ the full influence of their prayers, their authority, and their wisdom, to effect "that the strictness of a holy life may be thought necessary, and that repentance may be no more that trifling little piece of duty to which the errors of the late schools of learning, and the desires of men to be deceived in this article, have reduced it."

Such an opening would lead us to expect a severe book, and as "a severe book," he describes it in his dedication to Lord Carbery. It does, indeed, inculcate the necessity of an earlier and more lasting, a more earnest, and a more particular and minute repentance than the indolence of man is often willing to undertake, or his self-flattery to consider necessary.

Yet I am not aware that he has at all exceeded the strictness of his rules as laid down in his previous writings, or that he has expressed any greater austerity than is justified by the danger of sin, by the uncertainty of life, and the further uncertainty that, if life is spared, God's grace may be also continued to us. In discussing the probable event of a death-bed repentance, he has even expressed himself with more caution than he had done on some former occasions, referring men not only to the secret mercies of God, but to the fact that no precise period of time is laid down in Scripture as absolutely

necessary to the work of repentance; and concluding with some admirable rules for the conduct of a penitent under such unhappy circumstances. Such a man, he tells us, by self-examination, confession, restitution, submission to God's will, and a readiness to suffer whatever can come, by pouring out his complaints with great fervour and humility, and adding the best resolutions and the warmest charity in his power, may do "all that can be done at that time, and as well as it can then be done." He concludes this branch of his subject, as he does all his other chapters, with very moving and appropriate prayers, which are remarkably plainer, and, therefore, I think, much better than those in his "Life of Christ," and his "Holy Living."

I have mentioned this particular case of penitence, in the first instance, because it was this in which the harshness which Taylor predicates of his own work was chiefly likely to have appeared, and in which his previous expressions had been such as to excite a prejudice against the whole treatise. This, however, was not a question on which Taylor so much differed from contemporary divines, as he did on some other and very important topics which were naturally involved in the "Doctrine of Repentance," and, more particularly, of sins of infirmity. I mean the question of the origin and amount of man's natural inability to serve or please his Maker.

On this point Taylor has expressed himself, in his

preface, prepared to expect the charge of a departure from the doctrine of the church of England; and, as we have seen, he had already, in a former work, used language which might justly expose him to that suspicion. It may, therefore, be desirable to enter a little more fully into the principles which he really maintained, and the grounds on which he maintained them, both because those principles, though not always cautiously expressed, were, in fact, much nearer the truth than they have been sometimes represented; and because it will not be very difficult to shew wherein consisted that inaccuracy of reasoning which led him into a partial heterodoxy.

The plan of Taylor's "Essay on Repentance," if not necessarily, at least naturally, involved a discussion of original sin, and its consequences. He began by proving the necessity of repentance;—secondly, he went on to discuss its nature; thirdly, he proceeded to examine the things which are to be repented of.

Having, under the third head, discussed and overturned the Romish distinction between mortal and venial sins, (proving that all presumptuous and unrepented sin must be mortal,) and having prescribed the manner in which "actual single sins," and "habitual sins," were to be sorrowed for and forsaken, he was led to inquire what other sins, if any, there were, which needed a particular repentance?

And here, two questions occurred, first, whether

men are bound to repent of original sin? And, secondly, in what light are sins of infirmity to be regarded?

The first question naturally arose from the tenets then popular among divines. The second from the large allowance which men of carnal minds were apt to make themselves, when they contended that the existence of extremely sinful habits might not be inconsistent with a state of grace; inasmuch as the corruptions of nature still clung to the elect, and it was not they who transgressed, but sin which dwelt in them.

These points disposed of, the remainder of the discussion proceeded in its regular channel. The author, in the ninth chapter of his work, went on to shew the possibility of repentance, and its efficacy to the remission of sin. Under this head were involved some very curious secondary topics, as to the principles and practice of the ancient church with regard to those who had fallen into transgression after baptism; and the nature of "the sin against the Holy Ghost, and in what sense it is or may be unpardonable."

The tenth chapter treated of the fruits of repentance;—of the efficacy or inefficacy of that imperfect sorrow for sin which the Roman Catholics call "*attrition;*"—of the vanity of confession, absolution, penance, and all the other machinery of the Romish system, to procure pardon without a real "contri-

tion," accompanied with some admirable observations on the nature and proper use of these ecclesiastical helps to repentance and comforts to the penitent.

Each portion of the work concludes with applicable prayers, conceived in Taylor's warmest spirit of devotion, and in his improved and more simple style. The whole treatise evidently marks a man in earnest for the salvation of souls, and actuated by the feeling which he describes as his principal motive for undertaking it:—"Tu autem conversus, confirma fratres!" —"I hope," are his words, "I have received many of the mercies of a repenting sinner, and I have felt the turnings and varieties of spiritual intercourses; and I have often observed the advantages in ministering to others, and am most confident that the greatest benefits of our office may, with best effect, be communicated to souls in personal and particular ministrations. In the following book I have given advices, and have asserted many truths in order to all this. I have endeavoured to break in pieces almost all those propositions, upon the confidence of which men have been negligent of severe and strict living; I have cancelled some false grounds on which many answers in moral theology used to be made to inquiries in cases of conscience; I have, according to my weak ability, described all the necessities and great inducements of a holy life; and have endeavoured to do it so plainly, that it may be useful to

every man, and so inoffensively, that it may hurt no man."*

I have stated these particulars both to shew the manner in which the offensive section is connected with the body of the work, and, still more, to convince those who might otherwise have turned away from that work as controversial, or, perhaps, heretical, that by far the greatest proportion of its contents is purely and valuably practical; that they who may dissent most strongly from his conclusions in particular chapters, may read the rest with abundant approbation and advantage; and that, more particularly, his observations on mortal and venial sins; on the sin against the Holy Ghost,—and, on the devices of the Romish clergy, are distinguished by great originality and justness of sentiment, by acute argument, and a wide and critical acquaintance with Scripture and ecclesiastical antiquity.

The question, "Whether men are bound to repent of original sin?"—he might, perhaps, have answered by observing simply, (as he has incidentally noticed), that by the consent of those theologians who have attached most importance to it, original sin is remitted in baptism as to any punishment which might accrue from it; that, though it adheres to us, it is not penally imputed to us, and that what is innate and unavoidable is a misfortune, not a transgression, and, therefore, no proper subject for repentance.

* Vol. viii. p. cliv.

Nor is the solidity of this answer shaken by the opinion of Augustine, that "all our life-time, we are bound to mourn for the inconveniences and evil consequences derived from original sin;"—or by the determination of our church that "concupiscence," (which is allowed, on all hands, to be a necessary consequent of Adam's fall, and a mode in which the original corruption shews itself,) "partakes of the nature of sin."

It is, no doubt, a legitimate cause for *concern*, in those who either desire God's glory, or the happiness of their fellow-creatures, that they have no worthier sacrifice to render to the one than such imperfect services as only are in our power,—and that the other are (under the present state of things) exposed to so much misery which we can neither remove nor materially alleviate. And a knowledge of our fallen condition, as it must necessarily make us humble and cautious, so it may well serve to excite in us an aspiration after a better and happier existence,—the very glories of which, while we are banished from them, must make the heart sick with hope delayed.

If this, however, be called repentance, it is an improper use of the term, which is usually and correctly applied to such a sorrow as is excited by the commission of actions which we might have left undone, or by a neglect of such wise or virtuous deeds as have been in our power. It follows, therefore, that repentance, in its proper meaning, is not applicable to original sin.

It is very true, (though Taylor has, in vain and very needlessly, laboured to get rid of the supposed difficulty), that whatever is displeasing to God, and contrary to the purposes of his creation, is a *sin*; though, if it arises from causes over which we have no control, a merciful God will not impute it to us. And it is thus that "concupiscence," like every evil thought, is said by our church to "partake of the nature of sin," inasmuch as the overt act of an unclean desire is in itself offensive to the God of purity; though, unless we encourage or indulge in it, the God of mercy may overlook it in us, as a necessary consequence of our fallen condition; a monument of that wretchedness from which we are made free by Christ. But this will not put it into our power to repent of what we cannot help, though it may exalt our notions of God's goodness, as well as of our own daily dependance on his bounty and daily need of his forgiveness.

Still, however, the question remained, "if we cannot repent of original sin, why are we to be punished for it?" a difficulty which Taylor solved by cutting the knot at once, and denying that any man, for original sin alone, would be punished with damnation. A conclusion this was which all Arminians and some Calvinists would join him in maintaining, but in arriving at which, his process was not a happy one.

The answer, apparently most obvious, and which,

as I conceive, would have been most consistent with the general language of inspiration, would have been, that, without extenuating the amount of human corruption, or the fatal consequences which, if things had been left to their natural course, must have been incurred by all Adam's posterity; it is plain from Scripture that, in point of fact, the world never was thus left to itself. Where iniquity abounded, grace did much more abound. The promise of a Redeemer was made as soon as our first parents had sinned, and before they had earned their name of parent; and the sacrifice of Christ is allowed, on all hands, to have had a retrospective as well as a prospective efficacy, which, in all those who were brought to a knowledge of him, either before or after his coming, was fruitful of grace to enable them to struggle against their innate corruption, and of merciful atonement to free them from the punishment of those stains which still adhered to their nature.

To the objection that this dispensation only applied to the converted and baptized,—to those who had received the knowledge and badge of salvation, while infants unbaptized, and heathens, remained liable to God's wrath, and heirs of utter damnation,—he might have rejoined, that all such must be left to the uncovenanted mercies of a good and gracious Father; or he might have given, perhaps, a more plausible answer still,—that the merits of Christ's death and intercession may extend far beyond the limits of his

visible church; that his grace may supply the unavoidable deficiencies of those who have not heard his name; and that many may be led by his Spirit, and saved by his blood, who have only known of God that "he is, and that he is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him." This is pretty nearly the account which is given by the bishop of Winchester, in his able commentary on the eighteenth article of our church; nor do I know any solution which can more satisfactorily reconcile the certainty and greatness of the natural corruption of man, and his consequent need of a Redeemer, with the fact that the name of this Redeemer is not yet made known to all, and the presumption that a just and merciful God will not treat the impotent as if they were wilfully rebellious.

Unfortunately, Taylor went to work by another process, and busied himself, first, in extenuating the greatness and evil consequences of Adam's fall; next in exalting the free-will and remaining powers of man; lastly, in denying that concupiscence could be in itself sinful, unless it proceeded to a deliberate and cherished image, to which the soul reverted with pleasure.

His opinion as to the first of these points was the same with some of the schoolmen*, who believed that Adam, as first created, was no better nor wiser

* Note (YY.)

than any of his descendants; but that, when he was placed in Paradise, a supernatural grace was given to him, which enabled him to please God; to resist temptation,—and, by the use of the appointed and sacramental means, to live for ever.

Accordingly, the effect of his fall was, when thus explained, no more than a return to his natural condition, and his children lost nothing but the prospect of succeeding to certain valuable privileges which were theirs in reversion only, and were not inherent but superadded gifts, even in the instance of their first parent.

If he erred in the adoption of this doctrine, he certainly erred in good company, inasmuch as the same was maintained by Bull and by archbishop King*. It is, however, a doctrine which can hardly stand the test of Scripture, which not only is silent as to any superadded qualifications conferred on Adam to enable him to keep the first covenant, but which, moreover, expressly tells us, that God created man upright. The question, however, is apparently of no practical importance, since at whatever time Adam received the perfections of his being, whether at or after his creation, the consequences of the loss of those perfections would be the same both to himself and his descendants.

* Bull—Discourse on the first Covenant. Sermons, vol. iii. p. 1065. King on the Origin of Evil, chap. iv. sect. 8. p. 211. Ed. Cantab.

Taylor, however, went on to deny that the depravation of man's nature, after the fall, was so total as had been generally apprehended; and to attack the conclusions of the Westminster divines, who maintained, not only that man was "*very far* gone from original righteousness," but that he was *altogether* perverted, and incapable of any thing but evil.

He asserted, on the contrary, that, amid the deplorable ruin of the world, some fragments of the Divine image might yet be discovered; that not only freedom of will remained, but that, in some particular cases, the tendency of man was on the side of virtue.—"A man cannot naturally hate God, if he knows any thing of him.—A man naturally loves his parents; he naturally hates some sort of uncleanness. He naturally loves and preserves himself; and all those sins which are unnatural, are such which nature hates: and the law of nature commands all the great instances of virtue, and marks out all the great lines of justice."—"Here only our nature is defective. We do not naturally know, nor yet naturally love, those supernatural excellencies which are appointed and commanded by God, as the means of bringing us to a supernatural condition. That is, without God's grace, and the renovation of the Spirit, we cannot be saved*."

Here, too, it is probable, that most Arminians will

* Vol. ix. p. 41.

agree that he had a juster view of human nature as it now exists, and pursued a more correct interpretation of some well-known passages of Scripture than his opponents. He has here, in fact, said no more than bishop Butler and the bishop of Winchester have both maintained in discussing the same intricate subject *.

The fact is, indeed, that, with the allowances which all these divines have made,—the difference between their view of man's corruption, and that which is taken by the Calvinists, is not, as to any practical consequence, worth disputing. Both sides allow that man is so far fallen as to be unable, without grace, to rise to heaven or escape everlasting punishment; and Taylor, in particular, has, in many of his argumentative, and all his devotional passages, admitted in the humblest language, his vileness, his helplessness, his worthlessness. But, if the ruin be effectual, it signifies little whether it be total; and if man is, by nature, the heir of wrath, it is a question of very inferior importance, whether there may or may not be some scattered good qualities yet remaining about him, which may make a difference in his final lot, so far at least as a mitigation of punishment. Augustine himself never taught that Socrates and Marcus Aurelius were to be ranked in

* Butler's Analogy, pp. 81 and 135. Tomline, Refut. Calv. pp. 2—4.

the same category of eternal suffering with Simon Magus and Nero; but Augustine, nevertheless, like the Romish church and the Calvinists, was peremptory in consigning them to some portion of everlasting misery; and, in fact, if it be allowed that no flesh can escape except through Christ, it seems absolutely necessary, if we would escape from these revolting consequences, to suppose, as has been already hinted, an extension of the merits of Christ's blood, and the help of his Holy Spirit, beyond the limits of the visible church, and the list of those who have heard the tidings of salvation.

This Taylor appears, from some expressions in his "further Explications," to have suspected*. But he has not followed up this presumption to any length; and, in consequence, fluctuates between Augustine and Pelagius, too deeply impressed with the mercy of God to assent to the harsh doctrines of the first; too conscious of the necessity of spiritual illumination to embrace the self-flattery of the second.

This is not the only instance, however, in which he has underrated the consequences of Adam's transgression. He conceives that the sin of Adam and its immediate consequences, were answerable only for a small, "the smallest part," of the present corruption of our species.—"It is not his fault alone,

* Vol. ix. pp. 91—93.

nor ours alone, and neither of us is innocent."—"A great part is a natural impotency, and the other is brought in by our own folly." He imputes it, in great part, to the "many *concurrent* causes of evil which have influence upon communities of men, such as are, evil examples, the similitude of Adam's transgression, vices of princes, wars, impurity, ignorance, error, false principles, flattery, interest, fear, partiality, authority, evil laws, heresy, schism, spite and ambition, natural inclination, and other principiant causes; which, proceeding from the natural weakness of human constitution, are the fountain and proper causes of many consequent evils *.

Surely to represent those as *concurrent* causes which, by his own account of them, *proceed from* the great and common cause, is neither good logic nor good divinity. It is not even correct to say that the evil which is within us, and always ready to break forth on occasion, is materially increased by what are, at most, the exciting causes, and some of which are only the different modes and places in which the same internal corruption shews itself.

If it were true, which he supposes, after St. Chrysostom †, that "Adam having begun the principal of sin, we have added the interest;" that "every age grows worse, and adds some iniquity of its own to the former examples," we should have long since

* Vol. ix. p. 44. † Ib. p. 57.

arrived at an insuperable and insufferable height of iniquity; the earth would have loathed us as she loathed the Canaanites, and the "cursed race" would have been, ere now, exterminated by its increasing vices and violence.

But experience reads us a lesson extremely different. She gives us no reason to believe that any given form of society which the world has yet seen, has less than its share of peculiar occasions of evil. If civilized and polished society has more temptations, it has also more salutary restraints; and even the dangers which beset such a state of existence, are, if more numerous, hardly so formidable, as those of the earlier and ruder pages of history, where force is the law, and the strong man, and he only, "does that which is right in his own eyes."

So far from a progressive increase of wickedness, from the hypothesis of a golden age, deteriorated slowly into silver, brass, and iron; we find, on the contrary, while the family of man was small, and the intercourse of man with God not yet unfrequent; while want and tyranny, and the snares of larger communities were unknown, and while the recent punishment of the species, and the dreadful forms of the cherubim, yet visible on the ascent to Paradise, must have prevented all causes of depravity, but the one great cause, from operating, the first-born of Adam, for a very small offence, if any offence at all, the deliberate murderer of his brother. And, while

the natural life of man was yet a thousand years; while the penitent father and monarch of men was scarcely cold in his grave; we read of the earth being full of violence, and of sins which called down a common destruction on all but a single family.

These facts may convince us that we suffer not from a slowly accumulated burden, but from a malady at once contracted; that there is no reason to believe that the first access of wickedness was slighter than its more confirmed stages; or that any one age of the world has sufficient reason to complain of a greater abundance of iniquity than its fellows. On the whole, perhaps, the more polished and educated ages have the advantage, and the admonition of Protagoras might apply to those who desire the homeliness of a more simple state of society.

Οὕτως ὀιου καὶ νῦν, ὁστις σοι ἀδικωτατος φαινεται ἀνθρωπος τῶν ἐν νομοις και ἀνθρωποις τεθραμμενων, δικαιον ἀυτον ἔιναι, και δημιουργον τουτου του πραγματος, ἐι δεοι ἀυτον κρινεσθαι προς ἀνθρωπους ὅις μητε παιδεια ἐστι μητε δικαστηρια, μητε νομοι, μητε ἀναγκη μηδεμια διαπαντος ἀναγκαζουσα ἀρετης ἐπιμελεῖσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐιεν· ἀγριοι τινες, ὅιοι περ ὁυς περυσι Φερεκρατης ὁ ποιητης ἐδιδαξεν ἐπι Ληναιῳ· ἢ σφοδρα ἐν τοῖς τοιουτοις ἀνθρωποις γενομενος, ὥσπερ ὁι ἐν ἐκεινῳ τῳ χορῳ μισανθρωποι, ἀγαπησαις ἀν ἐι ἐντυχοις Εὐρυβατῳ και Φρυνωνδᾳ, και ἀνολοφυραι ἀν ποθῶν την τῶν ἐνθαδε ἀνθρωπων πονηριαν*.

There are other incidental topics in the Essay on

* Plato, Protagoras, Op. iii. 121. Ed. Bipont.

Repentance, and its apologies, on which the dicta of Taylor must be received with caution. He, in one passage, while reckoning up the causes which have added to the stock of Adam's original corruption, mentions, as one of them, the silence of God, during the earliest ages of the world, on the subject of a life beyond the grave.

"The first great cause of an universal impiety is, that, at first, God had made no promises of heaven; he had not propounded any glorious rewards, to be as an argument to support the superior faculty against the inferior, that is, to make the will choose the best and leave the worst, and to be as a reward for suffering contradiction."—"If God had been pleased to have promised to Adam the glories he hath promised us, it is not to be supposed he had fallen so easily. But he did not, and so he fell, and all the world followed his example, and most upon this account; till it pleased God, after he had tried the world with temporal promises, and found them also insufficient,"—"to cause us to be born anew by the revelations and promises of Jesus Christ*."

To say nothing of the inconsistency with which a writer who is the strenuous advocate of man's free-will, lest God should be suspected to be the author of sin, imputes to God in almost express words, a suppression of those lights, which only are effectual

* Pp. 42, 43.

to keep men from sin; there are few mistakes more palpable, or more easily refuted, than that which supposes the ancient Israelites, or their patriarchal ancestors, to have been without a knowledge of the immortality of the soul. The book of Job (perhaps the oldest in the world), expressly acknowledges it; St. Paul, when reasoning on the words of Jacob, respecting his pilgrimage, speaks in a manner which proves that, in his opinion, the father of the tribes expected such an enduring city; — the repeated promises of the Messiah, to arise from the race of Abraham, could have been no comfort to those who were, many generations before his coming, to be laid to sleep in the cave of Macpelah, unless they expected that they also were to awaken, and, with their descendants, to share in the privileges which that great Redeemer was to purchase. It is humiliating to see any men of genius and learning involved in the defence of such a paradox; but what shall be said when those men are Jeremy Taylor and Warburton?

Still, as has been already shewn, in the practical and devotional parts, and even in those chapters which, exclusively, contain the erroneous assertions to which I have alluded, there is abundance which may be read with admiration and improvement. He has sifted with uncommon force and learning the errors of Calvinism, as they respect the absolute decrees of God, and the damnation of unbaptized infants. His defence of free-will from the writings of

the early fathers will, though shorter, bear no unfavourable comparison with bishop Tomline's learned and able treatise on the same subject; and, on the whole, though the work is by no means faultless, it is still the work of the same author with the Liberty of Prophesying, and the Holy Living and Dying.

Having thus largely discussed the difference which, on the topic of original sin, existed between Taylor and the majority of the Church of England, — it is unnecessary for me to take any further notice of the works in which he re-stated and justified his peculiar opinion, the letters to Warner, and that to the Countess of Devonshire.

I pass on, therefore, to the essay which follows next in the series, and which is also dedicated to Warner; his "Real Presence and Spiritual of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament, proved against the Doctrine of Transubstantiation,"—a powerful and learned disquisition, of which the conclusions and doctrines deserve unqualified praise; though, even here, a desire to conciliate his antagonists, or an anxiety to raise as high as possible the honour of the Christian altar, has involved him occasionally in an illogical mode of reasoning, and thrown a needless obscurity around a plain doctrine of the Protestant church, and some very clear and comfortable texts of Scripture.

Thus he begins with stating the doctrine of the Protestants as to Christ's presence in the sacrament, as if it were that "the symbols become changed into

the body and blood of Christ, after a sacramental, that is, in a *spiritual, real* manner; so that all that worthily communicate, do by faith receive Christ really, effectually, and to all the purposes of his passion." In these words his meaning is pretty evident, but his manner of expression is hardly accurate.

How does he understand the word *sacramental?* He would probably answer, that a sacrament is a symbol; a sign of something besides itself,—"a means whereby we receive the thing intended, and a pledge to assure us thereof." In the present instance, then, it is a sign of Christ's body and blood; it is a means whereby our souls partake in the graces flowing from his sacrifice, and a pledge to assure us of our participation in those benefits. But, with "sacramental," in this sense, the term *real* is utterly inconsistent, inasmuch as the change which "sacramental" implies is figurative and conventional only. If a counter is taken to pass for a guinea, a change has undoubtedly taken place in its virtues and its effects, but it has not become a real golden coin. It is conventionally worth more than it was, but it is ivory and a counter still. And though we reverence the bread and wine after consecration, as the authentic image of the body and blood of him who died for us, it is not correct to say that any *real* change has taken place in their nature, though they have undoubtedly become the means of our obtaining a spiritual blessing. There are, in Scripture, two meanings of the word

spiritual: the one, something detached from and superior to matter; which is, apparently, the sense in which St. Paul, (in Taylor's own illustration,) contrasts the heavenly or spiritual tabernacle, with that tent which Moses set up as its image: the other, what we should more usually express by *virtual*, as when the same apostle speaks of himself as present in spirit, in the sentence pronounced in his absence, but by his authority, on the incestuous Corinthian. In this latter sense, the thing signified or represented is always spiritually present with its sign or representation, provided that this last is, in the first place, authentic; and, secondly, empowered to produce the same effect which its principal, if present, would have done. Thus, Christ was spiritually present as a Redeemer and a sacrifice for sin, in all the rites of the Jewish law, which, by God's appointment, shadowed out the benefits which his death was to bestow; and conveyed a share in those benefits to the Israelites, who partook in them faithfully. And this, as I conceive, is the sense in which he is also apprehended to be present in his capacity of victim, and to give his body and blood for our spiritual support, in the sacrament of the eucharist.

But this virtual presence is so far from a *real* one, that it is absolutely opposed to it. And this is the reason why the Romanists, who maintain the latter in its grossest sense, contend so strongly against the former; so that the word *real*, as Taylor has intro-

duced it, is unmeaning or worse; inasmuch as for the elements to be *really* changed into the body and blood of Christ, is the very thing for which the Romanists plead, and which is at complete variance with Taylor's previous statement, as well as with all his subsequent arguments.

Still, it may be urged, the doctrine of Taylor is really the doctrine of the reformed churches; as, where the Church of England teaches that "the body and blood of Christ are *verily* and *indeed* taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's supper." And where Calvin maintains, that "in the supper Jesus Christ, (viz. his body and blood,) is truly and indeed given under the signs of bread and wine."

But neither of these expressions favour the reality of the presence, though both explicitly set forth the efficacy of the symbols. These are very different assertions, and, in common life, a distinction is continually made between them. An estate is conveyed by the delivery of the title-deeds, a kingdom by the imposition of a crown. The enjoyment and possession both of the one and the other become, from that time, real and actual, though the estate may be in Cumberland, while the transaction of exchange or purchase takes place in London; and though, unquestionably, the kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland are not really within that golden circle which is the pledge and sign of sovereignty. What, indeed, is the meaning of any thing being present under its

symbols or representations, unless it be that the thing itself is not there, but that there is something else which supplies its place? Or, what but this can be the meaning of the *spiritual* presence of a *substance?* It is plain, then, that our reformers, in denying the *bodily* change of the elements, admitted no *real* change in them at all; though they did not fail to recognise the presence of a *Divine Power,* which communicated to those who partook in them faithfully, a share in the sacrifice and a union with the mystical body of the Lamb slain on Calvary.

But, though he has thus encumbered his propo sition with unnecessary difficulties, and expressed it in terms which hardly express the meaning of those whom he defends; yet the proposition itself, that Christ's body is no otherwise than spiritually present in the sacrament, he has established in his following sections, with great acuteness and learning.

He begins by proving that the doctrine of transubstantiation is not found in Scripture: first, by the admission of some of the most celebrated doctors of the Romish church; secondly, by a critical examination of the two principal passages which are usually urged in its behalf, the 6th chapter of St. John, and the words in which our Saviour instituted the sacraments.

On the first of these he has, perhaps, gone too far, in denying that it relates to the sacrament at all, or to any thing but Christ's doctrine, and the faith

which lays hold on it. This is contrary to the general opinion of the church; and it is strange that, if Christ had not, in this instance also, intended to allude to the eucharist, he should afterwards, when speaking of another thing, describe it in words not merely like, but identical.

Taylor, indeed, urges, that if the eucharist were intended, it would follow that no man could be saved without partaking in it; and therefore that infants, fools, and persons who are impeded by restraint or distance, must all necessarily perish. But this argument is worth little, since it would only put the one sacrament on the same footing with the other, as being, *in subjecto capaci*, the ordinary means of grace and salvation, without necessarily inferring that they who have not the means of obtaining it are to perish, any more than the penitent thief perished for want of baptism. No man is bound to an impossibility; but a neglect of the appointed means, when in our power, may be damnable in the one case as well as in the other. And this is all which necessarily follows from the supposition that Christ intended the sacrament when he said, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you."

He is more successful, however, when he goes on to observe that, supposing it to refer to the sacrament, it is plain that the eating and drinking here spoken of must not be material, but spiritual; first,

because the men of Capernaum were reproved for understanding his expressions in their gross and literal sense; secondly, because, whoever eats Christ's flesh hath eternal life. But this must be meant of a spiritual eating, and one which is effected by faith alone; since, if the eating were *bodily*, and the elements, as the Romanists pretend, were changed in *substance*, the wicked might eat Christ as well as the worthy communicant. But, again, what Christ calls his body, he also calls bread, (ver. 51, 58); if, therefore, the words are taken literally, they may prove consubstantiation, but not transubstantiation, since the last implies a total change of the element. And consubstantiation even the Romanists allow to be impossible.

The argument drawn from the words of institution he invalidates with equal success. In the first place, he observes, that, out of the whole sentence, "Take, eat, this is my body," &c. the Church of Rome separates "Hoc est corpus meum," and says, that "these words pronounced by the priest with due intention, do effect the change of the bread into Christ's body."—"But, by what argument can it be proved that these words, 'take and eat,' are not as effective of the change as 'Hoc est corpus meum?' If they be, then the taking and eating do consecrate, and it is not Christ's body till it is taken and eaten; and then, when that is done, it is so no more; and, besides that reservation, circumgestation, adoration,

elevation of it, must of themselves fall to the ground, it will also follow, that it is Christ's body only in a mystical, spiritual, and sacramental manner. That Christ used these words is true, and so he used all the other; but did not tell which were the consecrating words, nor appoint them to use these words, but to do the thing, and so to remember and represent his death."

St. Basil, he goes on to urge, affirms that the form of the consecration of the eucharist is not delivered to us; and St. Gregory teaches, that "the apostles consecrated the eucharist only by saying the Lord's Prayer;" and, above all, it is apparent, that the apostles did not suppose these words to be of so vital importance to the efficacy of the sacrament, as the Church of Rome maintains, since the evangelists and St. Paul write these very expressions differently.

But, if the Roman Catholics make use of these words in a *proper*, not in a figurative sense, then it is a declaration of something already in being, and not effective of any thing after it. "Est is" "is," not "shall be;" but "by the confession of the Roman doctors, the bread is not transubstantiated till the *um* in *meum* be quite out."—"They affirm, that it is made Christ's body, by saying it is Christ's body; but their saying so must suppose the thing done, or else their saying so is false; and, if it be done before, then, to say it, does not do it at all, because it is done already." The thing is simple, if the words are

regarded as declaratory only of the designation of the elements; but, if a change is to be operated, at what time does this change begin; and how, when it is, at most, only inchoate, can we speak of it as completed?

But, what is stronger and more to the purpose than all this ingenious fencing with the Romanists at their own weapons, he reminds us that, as the eucharist itself was, in the external and ritual part, an imitation of a sacramental custom already in use among the Jews; so also were the very words which Christ spoke an imitation of the words which were used in that ancient ceremony. The Jews said, "This is the bread of sorrow which our fathers ate in Egypt."—"This is the passover;"—and this passover was called the body of the Paschal Lamb; nay, it was called the body of our Saviour, and our Saviour himself. — "So that here the words were made ready for Christ, and made his by appropriation."—"He is the true passover, which he then affirming, called that which was the antitype of the passover, the 'body' of the true passover, to wit, in the same sacramental sense in which the like words were affirmed in the Mosaical passover." *

But, as an additional reason to make us conclude that Christ called the bread his body in a figurative sense, he urges that, in the language which he spoke, there is no word which can express "significat;" but

* Vol. ix. p. 469.

they use the word "*is*."—"The Hebrews and the Syrians always join the names of the signs with the things signified; and, since the very essence of a sign is to signify, it is not an improper elegancy, in those languages, to use *est* for *significat*." In the New Testament, the same manner of speaking is retained; as he proves from "the field *is* the world," "I *am* the door," "my Father *is* the husbandman," "the candlesticks *are* the churches," &c.

It is reasonable, therefore, to believe that Christ spoke on this occasion as he spoke on others; more particularly since the very institution of the sacrament is, in itself, representative, significant, and commemorative, (according both to St. Paul and our Saviour himself,) of the death and sufferings of the latter.

And, that all sacraments and transactions of the kind were, in ancient days, accompanied with figurative and significant words and actions, he proves by the fact that μυστηριον is the word used by the Greeks to express our word sacrament; that, in Exodus, the paschal lamb is called "the passover," that is, the passing of the angel over the houses of Israel; and, that this instance is so much the more apposite, because it is the forerunner of the blessed eucharist, which succeeded that, as baptism did circumcision.—In this manner six sections are occupied.

In the seventh section, he establishes the same

figurative explication of the words, from the manner and circumstances of the institution, from the fact that, before his passion, his body was not really broken nor his blood shed; so that the broken bread and the wine poured out must have been his body, not truly, but figuratively; from the presumption that it cannot be imagined that the apostles understood it in the literal sense, when they saw his body stand by, unbroken, alive, integral, hypostatical; and that, as the words of institution shew that it was designed to represent his *death*, which was then future, it could not be necessary or useful to introduce on such an occasion his *real* body; since, if this had been the case, the shadow would have become the substance, and the sacrifice of Christ for the sins of the world would have taken place before his sufferings on Mount Calvary.

What follows is admirably clear and rational:—

"It is but an imperfect conception of the mystery to say, that it is the sacrament of Christ's body only, or his blood; but it is 'ex parte rei,' a sacrament of the death of his body: and to us a participation or exhibition of it, as it became beneficial to us; that is, as it was crucified, as it was our sacrifice. And this is so wholly agreeable to the nature of the thing, and the order of the words, and the body of the circumstances, that it is next to that which is evident in itself, and needs no further light but the considering the words and design of the institution; espe-

cially, since it is consonant to the style of Scripture in the sacrament of the passover, and very many other instances. It wholly explicates the nature of the mystery, it reconciles our duty with the secret, it is free of all inconveniences, it prejudices no right, nor hinders any real effect it hath or can have; and it makes the mystery intelligible and prudent, fit to be discoursed of and inserted into the rituals of a wise religion."*

In the 8th and 9th sections, he discusses the arguments advanced from Scripture in favour of transubstantiation, and adduces many scriptural arguments for the opposite side. In the 10th, he shews, at considerable length, the absurdity of believing any thing which is in direct opposition to the senses.

This is one of the most curious and able parts of the treatise, in which he discusses many important questions of God's power; of the distinction between things which may be the proper subject of a miracle, and things naturally impossible; of the different properties of body and of spirit; of the distinction between a belief in transubstantiation and in the Holy Trinity; of the remarkable circumstances under which Christ appeared to the apostles after his resurrection; of the impossibility of conceiving an accident in a state of separation from its substance, and of the absurd and even blasphemous consequences which result from representing the body of Christ

* Vol. ix. p. 494.

as contained under the accident of bread and wine. —The whole is a treasury of sound logical argument and acute criticism; but it would be difficult to find any particular specimen which would not be too long for selection.

The 12th section is employed in shewing the comparatively recent introduction of the doctrine in question into the church, and that it was unknown, or at least not received, by the most considerable of the fathers. In discussing the sentiments of some of these, he had, certainly, expressions to encounter which might have perplexed an ordinary controversialist: but Taylor's knowledge of their writings and their peculiar style was so extensive, that he was able to distinguish, with remarkable acuteness, between assertions which really apply to the point in question and those which are equally reconcileable with either hypothesis, — those which prove too much, or those which only seem to tell against the Protestants through an ignorance of the hyperbolical language usual with the writers of those ages.

To these alleged testimonies, he opposes many others,—from Tertullian, Origen, Clemens Alexandrinus, Cyprian, Eusebius, Ephren Syrus, Epiphanius, Macarius, Gregory of Nazianzum, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Augustine, and Gelasius.

He very sensibly remarks, that, as his object is to prove a negative, and to shew that the doctrine of transubstantiation was not the universal or catholic

doctrine of the church, it was not necessary for him to produce a general consent, or even a majority of the ancient writers; since, if even a smaller number of the eldest and most considerable dissented, it is plain that the doctrine which he opposed could not answer to the rule of Vincentius Lirinensis, "Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus." He also observes, that, though rhetorical exaggeration, hyperbolical expressions of love and reverence, and other causes of the same kind, may have led the fathers to use many phrases stronger than their sober opinion warranted, on the side of the Romish doctors; yet, in opposition to the hypothesis of a real bodily presence, they would never have spoken that which they did not seriously believe and intend to maintain; inasmuch as it could never be their object to undervalue or diminish from the intrinsic dignity of the holy sacrament.

He remarks, that so far was transubstantiation from being a Catholic doctrine, that it was fiercely disputed among Catholics in the time of Charles the Bald; when the contrary was maintained by Rabanus, Bertram, and, above all, by the illustrious scholar Duns Scotus. In England, much later, the same opinion might be held unblamed; and even the Lateran Council pronounced nothing against it; though, thirty-six years after, in 1251, a council of only fifty-four prelates, held at Rome, thought fit to declare the real presence an article of faith. Stephen,

bishop of Augustodunum, in 1100, first invented the word "transubstantiation." — "He christened the article and gave the name, and this congregation confirmed it."

In the thirteenth and concluding section, he examines the practical part of the dispute, and demonstrates, against the Romanists, the danger of paying divine honour to that which, even on their own principles, (through many circumstances of secret imperfection in the words spoken, the intention, or the personal character of the minister,) may be no more than bread, and which no good or sufficient argument has been advanced to prove that it can be God.

He relates, on the authority of Bishop Andrews, a remarkable instance in which the Jesuits, who were to die for the Gunpowder treason, refused to stake their salvation on their assurance that the bread and wine were the very body and blood which had been sacrificed for their sins; and when Garnet replied, that though the general doctrine was certain, a man might well doubt of the particular instance. And he urges, that "as we must pray with faith and without doubting, so it is fit we should worship; and yet, in this case, and upon these premises, no man can choose but death, and therefore he ought not to worship: '*Quod dubitas ne feceris.*'"

He concludes with an eloquent picture of the scandal thus given to Jews and Turks, and the ill effects of the example on heathen idolaters.

The style of this essay, as well as of those which follow it, is easy, clear, flowing, and vigorous, with less of his characteristic eloquence than some of those productions which I have already noticed, but extremely well calculated to sustain attention, and to carry his reader without fatigue through an intricate and lengthened argument. There are, however, some instances of eloquence as well as power, and there are several in which he has indulged in a tone of sarcastic humour which seems to shew that his talent for satire might have been (had he chosen to employ it) as considerable as any of his other powers of composition. Such a passage occurs in his dedication, where he observes that, because the doctors of the Romish church "met with opponents at all hands, they proceeded to a more vigorous way of arguing; they armed legions against their adversaries; *they confuted at one time* in the town of Beziers, *sixty thousand persons; and, in one battle, disputed so prosperously and acutely, that they killed about ten thousand men that were sacramentaries.* And this Bellarmine gives as an instance of the works of his church; this way of arguing was used in almost all the countries of Christendom, till, by crusadoes, massacres and battles, burnings and the constant carnificia and butchery of the inquisition, (which is the main proof of the papacy, and does more than 'Tu es Petrus,') they prevailed far and near, and men durst not oppose the evidence on which they

fought!" Such indignant satire was not ill employed on the sanguinary follies of popery. But of this kind of talent more instances are to be found in his two succeeding essays.

The former of these was, as I have already had occasion to notice,—a task imposed on him by the bishops of the Irish church, and elicited, in a great degree, by the gross and prevalent superstitions of the Irish populace. It is, however, not a work addressed to that populace; indeed, from some expressions in his preface, he seems to have early despaired of its rendering such persons any immediate service. It is addressed, throughout, to the Irish clergy, and the educated part of the Irish laity; nor am I aware of any work (out of the many which have appeared, and, in their time, done good service to the cause of Protestantism,) so well calculated to answer its object; or to excite, in the mind of a well-informed Papist, a conviction of the necessity of reformation in his own church, and a belief that this necessary work has been competently effected in ours.

The style is never oratorical, seldom even eloquent in that sense and character of eloquence which a person who has formed his notions of Jeremy Taylor from his sermons and devotional works, would anticipate. But it is easy, buoyant and elastic; effectually removed from the opposite evils of languor or inflation, or that tediousness which is the immediate consequence of both. The English is thoroughly

good, natural, and unaffected; with some considerable admixture, indeed, of scholastic terms; but these, for a reason which will be shortly given, entirely appropriate to his subject and his readers. The tone of his controversy is simple, friendly, and affectionate; it is such as a Christian bishop may well hold towards the people of his charge; and he, throughout, abstains, with Christian care, from imputing to the individuals of the party opposed to him a concurrence in, or even a knowledge of, the odious consequences which he frequently deduces from their opinions. Against penal courses of every kind he, in his preface, speaks with the same abhorrence as when he wrote his Liberty of Prophesying; and the spirit of his treatise is the mild and ingratiating spirit of an apology for differing from the Romanists, rather than of a formal attack on their principles. Even his satire (of which formidable weapon he makes abundant and able use) is conveyed under the form of "banter," rather than of scoff or insult. Without flattering their prejudices, without even sparing them, he talks to his adversaries as if they were already his friends, or one day to become so. And, above all, he talks to them as a Romanist; he addresses them with a perfect knowledge of their writers,—their ecclesiastical history,—their schoolmen,—their traditions, and their prejudices; a perfect familiarity with both their strong and their weak grounds; a power and habit of ap-

pealing to their own writers as his best and most frequent authorities; and a dexterity which has never been exceeded in opposing the contradictions of those writers to each other, laying bare their fallacies, and gently but not insolently exciting indignation against their corruptions, and a smile against their absurdities.

To confirm Protestants in their religion, it may or it may not have power. It presupposes a familiarity with Romish writers which Protestants rarely possess; and those Protestants who are tempted to change their religion for a worse, are generally, as I apprehend, impelled to do so by some single broad and powerful, though mistaken, principle or feeling which is too concentrated and too closely intrenched in some peculiarity of habit or intellect, to give way to such a war of detail as is carried on by Taylor.

But to shake the former opinions of an intelligent Roman Catholic, and to conciliate him for the reception of new;—to detach him from an implicit confidence in his ancient guides, without inclining him, at the same time, to a sceptical aversion from all guides whatever; — to point out the contradictions of a false religion, without making all religion appear ridiculous, — I know no work which has greater power than the "Dissuasive" of Taylor; except that which, in many respects, it greatly resembles, the "Lettres Provinciales" of Pascal. As a composition, these last, perhaps, have the superi-

ority in dramatic effect, from the lively and eloquent dialogue in which the first part is conveyed, and which is, in some degree, carried on by the tone and spirit of the following letters. But it is of more importance to observe, in an estimate of the merits of the two authors, that all the arguments, the instances, the examples, the "badinage" of Taylor, are urged for the sake of a definite and calculated end; while Pascal's exposition of the morals of the Jesuits and the politics of the court of Rome, conduct to consequences which the author was not prepared to adopt, and from which he would have shrunk back in horror.

The "Dissuasive" is divided into three chapters; the first devoted to the exposure of the different innovations which the church and court of Rome have introduced into the faith and devotions, and ecclesiastical government of Christians. In this he shews that the power of imposing new articles of belief is, in itself, a comparatively modern usurpation; that the same charge of novelty and departure from apostolic and primitive authority may be brought against indulgences, purgatory, transubstantiation and half-communion; the injunction of public prayers in a foreign or obsolete language; the veneration of images; the pictures of God; the papal supremacy; the invocation of saints; and the supposed insufficiency of Scripture without tradition.

On all these subjects he evinces a knowledge not

only of the fathers, but the schoolmen, the divines of the middle ages, and the modern Romish disputants; which few of his antagonists could equal, and, perhaps, still fewer Protestants could have supplied.

Against the alleged power of the church to dictate an article of faith, he urges the words of St. Paul, (Gal. i. 8.) the sentence of the third general council, held at Ephesus, and the notorious abuses of this power by the Romish church, who have determined points of history in opposition to known authorities, and continually, though gradually, added to the ancient staple of orthodoxy.

Against the antiquity of indulgences he brings the testimony of many of their own writers, and fixes their commencement either in the 12th or the beginning of the 13th century. He urges the perfect silence of all antiquity on the subject; and that, in their origin, they were no abatement of any supposed sufferings in purgatory, but a simple absolution from some part of that penance which the confessor had imposed on his living penitent. And though indulgences were, in the time of the fathers, unknown, and no definite censure of them is, therefore, to be looked for in their writings, yet there are in those writings, as well as in Scripture, very many passages destructive of the principle on which indulgences rest; as where the greatest saints are enjoined to regard themselves as unprofitable servants: where

we are taught that repentance merely consists in a return to a good life and a sound and active faith; and, more particularly, where we find, as in St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, and St. Bernard, the custom discommended of going to seek pardon of sins by pilgrimage.

The same subject he pursues when discussing the question of purgatory, which doctrine he judiciously distinguishes from the really ancient doctrine or practice of prayer for the dead, and of which he proves the origin to reach no further back than the eleventh century after Christ, and then to have been held as no article of faith, but merely a speculative opinion. He proves its derogation from the merits of the blood of Christ, and instances the folly of those legends on the credit of which the notion first gained ground among mankind. The other instances contained in the first chapter he follows up with the same critical acumen, and concludes with the observation, that the Romanists "have taught every priest that can scarce understand his breviary, (of which, in Ireland, there are but too many,) and many of the people, to ask, 'where our religion was before Luther?' Whereas it appears by the premises, that it is much more easy for us to shew our religion before Luther, than for them to shew theirs before Trent. And although they can shew too much practice of their religion in the degenerate ages of the church, yet we can and do clearly shew ours in the purest

and first ages; and can and do draw lines, pointing to the times and places where the several rooms and stories of their Babel were builded, and where polished, and where furnished.

"But when the keepers of the field slept, and the enemy had sown tares, and they had choked the wheat and almost destroyed it; when the world complained of the infinite errors in the church, and being oppressed by a violent power, durst not complain so much as they had cause: and, when they who had cause to complain, were yet themselves very much abused, and did not complain in all they might; when divers excellent persons, when almost all Christian princes did complain heavily of the corrupt state of the church and of religion, and no remedy could be had, but the very intended remedy" [the general council,] "made things much worse, then it was that divers Christian kingdoms, and particularly the Church of England—

("Tum primum, senio docilis, tua sæcula, Roma,
Erubuit; pudet exacti jam temporis, odit
Præteritos fœdis cum religionibus annos!")

being ashamed of the errors, superstitions, heresies, and impieties, which had deturpated the face of the church, looked in the glass of Scripture and pure antiquity; and washed away those stains with which time and inadvertency, and tyranny, had besmeared her; and being thus cleansed and washed, is accused

by the Roman parties of novelty, and condemned because she refuses to run into the same excess of riot and deordination. But we cannot deserve blame, who return to our ancient and first health, by preferring a new cure before an old sore.*"

The second chapter relates to those doctrines and practices of the Roman church, which "in themselves, or in their true and immediate consequences, direct impieties and give warranty to a wicked life."

In this part of his work, after exposing the danger of the Romish doctrines as to the legality of delaying repentance; proving the inefficacy of what they call attrition, and the defective estimate which they make of that contrition which only can find favour with God; pointing out the practical mischief resulting from confession, penance, and satisfaction, as now used by them; and cross-examining and comparing the various and contradictory requisites which, even according to the estimate of their own doctors, are necessary to make indulgences available; he goes on to discuss their erroneous distinctions between mortal and venial sins; and their fancy that the opinion of one grave doctor is enough to make a matter of faith or duty "probable."

He here instances many of the abominable practical tenets which have, on this pretence, been received, or, at least, tolerated; the cases in Toletanus, noticed by Pascal, that, "if a nobleman be set upon

* Vol. x. pp. 185, 186.

and may escape by going away, he is not tied to it, but may kill him that intends to strike him with a stick,"—"that mortal sins become venial when done in the violence of passion or drunkenness;"—that "it is lawful for a man to expose his bastards to the hospital, to conceal his own shame;"—that "if one of a married couple falls into heresy, the marriage is dissolved, and the other may marry another;" with many similar circumstances of horror and absurdity.

Nor can it be pleaded, he observes, in any of these cases, that such an opinion is but the private opinion of one or more of their doctors. This would, indeed, in an article of faith, be an insufficient proof of the opinion of the church in general; but as a rule of life, and in questions between virtue and vice, it is their own avowed and general principle, that "a private opinion of any one grave doctor may be safely followed, or the example of good men." Accordingly, he observes, "if an evil custom get amongst men, that very custom shall legitimate the action, and Christ is not your rule, but the examples of them that live with you, or are in your eye and observation." Those who shall compare these sections with the corresponding passages in the "Lettres Provinciales," will receive no small share both of amusement and advantage; but they will see little reason to postpone the genius of Taylor to that of the learned and witty Frenchman. In piety, it is useless and unnecessary to compare such men as

they were, the daily conversation of each of whom was elevated above the world, and who have long since met in peace and happiness amid the quiet shades of paradise.

The following sections are taken up with discussing the foreign or obsolete language of the Romish prayers, the idolatrous nature of many of them, the strange impiety of their system of exorcism; (where he goes over much of the same ground with Reginald Scott, in his "Discovery of Witchcraft;" their confidence in observances merely superstitious and unauthorized; their reliance on the "opus operatum" of the sacraments, so as to make them not the "instrument," but "the suppletory of virtue;" their direct idolatry in honouring the cross and certain images, even with "latria," or the highest degree of worship which can be paid to the Deity. And he winds up all by observing, that "although we do not doubt, but that the goodness of God does so prevail over all the follies and malice of mankind, that there are in the Roman communion many very good Christians; yet they are not such as they are Papists, but by something that is nigher and before that, something that is of an abstract or more sublime consideration. And, though the good people amongst them are what they are by the grace and goodness of God, yet by all or any of these opinions they are not so; but the very best suffer diminution and alloy by these things; and very many are wholly subverted and destroyed*.

* Vol. x. p. 246.

In the last chapter he returns again to the casuistry of the church of Rome, and the immoral tendency of many of her doctrines; more particularly those which teach that the pope may, under certain circumstances, and to obtain a greater good, dispense with even lawful oaths, and the most solemn and innocent engagements. He urges also the exemption pleaded by their clergy from the temporal power; and the extravagant notions of the right of popes to excommunicate, depose, and even condemn to death, heretical princes. In these observations, however, I am not aware that there is any thing worth particular notice. Enough may have been already said to prove the work of which I am speaking to be, for its length, one of the fullest and ablest expositions of the errors of popery, and to place Jeremy Taylor on as high an elevation among controversial as among devotional and practical writers.

The second part of the "Dissuasive from Popery" was written in vindication of the former from the attacks of two priests, White and Serjeant: the latter of whom, more particularly, he severely chastises in the Introduction, for the slighting manner in which he had spoken of Scripture, and the absurd and illogical character of many of his objections. In the same place, he discusses, at considerable length and with much acuteness, the nature and real value of tradition; and he exposes the Romish notion of the infallibility of the fathers, laying down some admir-

able rules for the manner in which their authority may be used in the interpretation of Scripture, and in ascertaining the sense of the church at the times in which they respectively flourished. He concludes, that Mr. Serjeant and his party were, in truth, the men that went on no adequate grounds: that "in the Church of Rome there is no 'sure footing,' no certain acknowledged rule of faith; but, while they call for an assent above the nature and necessity of the thing, they have no warrant beyond the greatest uncertainty."

The work itself is divided into two books, each containing several sections. In the first he treats of the meaning of the term "church," under which he includes not the clergy only, nor a small part of them, but the great body of believers. He shews, that even those assemblies, which, under the name of "general councils," have passed for representatives of the church, were, in ancient times, composed not of bishops only, but other eminent clergymen, and, not infrequently, of laymen; and he examines, in a very free tone, and one which, in many instances, reminds us of the better parts of Jortin,—the slight claims which most of those councils have had to pass for œcumenical, the variable and capricious distinctions which the Church of Rome has made in the different degrees of authority which she ascribes to different councils, and the vague, and, in some cases, impossible tests which she proposes of their validity. He

then proceeds to the decisions of the popes, proving from the innumerable contradictions of those briefs themselves, from the impossibility which their own canonists mutually allow, of knowing which is the true pope, when there are different pretenders to the see; or whether he that is acknowledged pope may not have vitiated his election by simony, heresy; or, as in the case of Constantine the Second, defect of holy orders, how hard it may be for a Roman Catholic, even on the received principles of his faith, to determine whether he is in the church or no, or what head he ought to follow. And, after examining and exposing, in a striking peroration, the fifteen marks of the true church proposed by Bellarmine, he concludes with exhorting them to demonstrate their church, if they can, "in the prescript of the law, of the prophets, of the Psalms, of the evangelists, and all the canonical authorities of the holy books*."

Having thus shewn the utter insufficiency of the guides relied on by the Romish church, he now proceeds to shew, in his second chapter, the sufficiency of the sacred volume as a guide to salvation.

To prove that the Scriptures are the only rule of faith acknowledged by antiquity, he pleads the testimonies of almost all the most considerable ecclesiastical writers, and the very name of canon or "rule," which the universal church has given to the Bible.

* Vol. x. p. 383.

"The word itself," he observes, "ends this inquiry; for it cannot be a canon, if any thing be put to it or taken from it, said St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and Varinus."

The pretence of the difficulty of the Scriptures, which the Romanists have always urged, and which some Protestants, to answer a temporary purpose, have, sometimes, too largely asserted, — he answers by the declarations of Cyril, Chrysostom, Clemens Alexandrinus, Athanasius, and Augustine; confining the δυσνοητα to such points alone as are not necessary to salvation; stating the rule of antiquity that Scripture is to be expounded by Scripture; and that, though God has given other helps in the appointment and preservation of an order of men as guides of souls, yet these last are bound to draw all their doctrines from this single and sacred fountain. A very interesting and amusing chapter on "Traditions" follows, in which he proves that no necessary article of faith depends on tradition alone; except it be that which is, in the first instance, necessary to the reception of the Scriptures themselves, the tradition that they are the word of God, and a sufficient guide to heaven.

Of the particulars which Cardinal Perron, and others, have pretended to rest on tradition only, he shews that (1.) The Trinity may be proved from Scripture, and was so proved at the Nicene council. That (2.) for the baptism of infants there is, at least,

a strong presumption from the words and analogy of Scripture; and that, after all, as he seems to account it, it is hardly an essential of salvation. The validity of the baptism of heretics, which is instanced (3.) could never, he says, have been doubted, if men had duly weighed the commission which Christ gave to all ministers of his religion. (4.) The procession of the Holy Ghost both from the Father and the Son, he treats with little ceremony, as an obscure and doubtful question, which cannot be esteemed a necessary article of faith, without damning all the eastern churches; but which may, nevertheless, be probably shewn from the sacred writings. (5.) The observation of the Lord's day he denies to be an article of faith, or essentially necessary doctrine; regarding it as a matter of discipline and external rite, and so far from being a successor or substitute for the Jewish sabbath, (which was done away with entirely in the abolition of the Mosaic law), that both days were, at first, kept by the Christians with equal reverence; yet "both with liberty, but with intuition to the avoiding offences, and the interests of religion."—He observes, however, it may be abundantly proved from Scripture, that there should be some time sanctified and set apart for the service of God; and "that the circumstances of religion are in the power of the presidents of religion; and then it will follow from Scripture, that the apostles, or their successors, or

whoever did appoint the Sunday festival, had not only great reason but full authority*."

He then proceeds to give many instances of alleged traditions of contradictory import, — of inherent absurdity, and of dates notoriously modern. He lays down, as a proper criterion in all such controversies, the well-known canon of Vincentius Lirinensis; and, by the application of this rule, arrives at the consequence that "all the doctrines of faith and good life are contained in the plain places of Scripture; and besides it there are, and there can be, no articles of faith."

The same topic he discusses in the two following chapters, to nearly the same effect; and employing nearly the same arguments as he had done in his "Liberty of Prophesying;" establishing the Apostles' Creed as the only necessary rule of belief; and exposing, with considerable energy, the monstrous power assumed by the court of Rome, of introducing into the confessions of the church new articles of faith, and altering and suppressing the Catholic doctrine. That they claim and exert such a power he proves by the writings of their own doctors; — by the alterations which they have notoriously introduced in the practice and professions of the ancient church; — by the frauds and pretended miracles to which

* P. 437.

they have recurred in order to establish such novelties; frauds which have been, in many instances, acknowledged, with shame, by their own ablest partizans; and miracles which, by the common testimony of Scripture and the ancient fathers, however pretended, ought to be of no force to establish a doctrine against Scripture and the consent of antiquity. In the sixth section he proceeds still further to make good his charge by a curious history of expurgatory indices; and, in the seventh, he charges them, that, "having done these things to propagate their new doctrines, and to suppress those which are more ancient and catholic, they are so implacably angry at all that dissent from them, that they only kill them, where they have power, but damn them all, so far as their sentence can prevail."

This is a very impressive and interesting chapter. He shews the unchristian spirit of such a procedure by the fact that God has reserved all judgment to himself; that his mercy absolves many persons who, in his just judgment, were condemned; and that it becomes a Christian to act, therefore, on the principle generally adopted by Protestants, and to judge no man's person, far less any states of men.

"Besides these things," he proceeds, "there is a strange spring and secret principle in every man's understanding, that it is oftentimes turned about by such impulses of which no man can give any account. We all remember a most wonderful instance of it in

the disputation between the two Reynolds, John and William; the former of which being a Papist and the latter a Protestant, met and disputed with a purpose to confute and to convert each other, and so they did; for those arguments which were used prevailed fully against their adversary, and yet did not prevail with themselves. The Papist turned Protestant, and the Protestant became a Papist, and so remained to their dying day." —— "But, further yet, he [the consistent Protestant] considers the natural and regular infirmities of mankind; and God considers them much more. He knows that in man there is nothing admirable but his ignorance and his weakness; his prejudices, and the infallible certainty of being deceived in many things; he sees that wicked men oftentimes know much more than very good men; and that the understanding is not of itself considerable in morality, and effects nothing in rewards and punishments: it is the will only that rules man, and can obey God. He sees, and deplores it, that many men study hard and understand little; that they dispute earnestly, and understand not one another at all; that affections creep in so certainly and mingle with their arguing, that the argument is lost, and nothing remains but the conflict of two adversaries' affections; that a man is so willing, so easy, so ready to believe what makes for his opinion; so hard to understand an argument against himself; that it is plain it is the principle within, not the argument without, that determines

him. He observes also, that all the world, (a few individuals excepted), are unalterably determined to the religion of their country, of their family, of their society; that there is never any considerable change made, but what is made by war and empire, by fear and hope. He remembers, that it is a rare thing to see a Jesuit of the Dominican opinion, or a Dominican (until of late,) of the Jesuit; but every order gives laws to the understanding of their novices, and they never change. He considers there is such ambiguity in words, by which all lawgivers express their meaning; that there is such abstruseness in mysteries of religion, that some things are so much too high for us, that we cannot understand them rightly; and yet they are so sacred and concerning, that men will think they are bound to look into them as far as they can; that it is no wonder if they quickly go too far, where no understanding, if it were fitted for it, could go far enough; but in these things it will be hard not to be deceived, since our words cannot rightly express those things; that there is such variety of human understandings, that men's faces differ not so much as their souls; and that, if there were not so much difficulty in things, yet they could not but be variously apprehended by several men: and then, considering that, in twenty opinions, it may be, not one of them is true;" — "and every man is too apt to overvalue his own opinion, — and as he loves those that think as he does, so he is ready to hate them that do not; and then, secretly, from wishing evil to him,

he is apt to believe that evil will come, and that it is just it should: and, by this time the opinion is troublesome, and puts other men on their guard against it; and then, while passion reigns, and reason is modest and patient, and talks not loud like a storm, victory is more regarded than truth, and men call God into the party; and his judgments are used for arguments, and the threatenings of Scripture are snatched up in haste, and men throw 'arrows, fire-brands, and death,' and by this time all the world is in an uproar. All this, and a thousand things more, the English Protestants considering, deny not their communion to any Christian who desires it, and believes the Apostles' Creed, and is of the religion of the four first general councils; they hope well of all that live well; they receive into their bosom all true believers of what church soever; and for them that err, they instruct them, and then leave them to their own liberty to stand or fall before their own master*."

Such were the latest opinions, (for this, as I have already elsewhere observed, was the latest work,) of the author of the "Liberty of Prophesying;" and so far, I repeat, was he, when himself in possession of power and dignity, from renouncing or obscuring his own previous sentiments.

Of the remaining sections of the work, a less exact account may be sufficient.

In the ninth section he goes on to urge, that the

* Pp. 508, 510.

Church of Rome "teaches as doctrines the commandments of men;" and in the tenth and eleventh, with which the first book concludes, he discusses the topic of auricular confession at greater length, but to nearly the same purport with the language which he had held in his sermon on the Gunpowder Treason.—The second book, which is divided into seven sections, is occupied in making good, and extending the arguments employed in the first part of the Dissuasive,—on the subjects of Indulgences; Purgatory; Transubstantiation; the Half Communion; Service in an unknown Tongue; the Worship of Images; and Picturing God the Father and the Holy Trinity.—These subjects he may be almost said to have exhausted. It is certain, at least, that he has accumulated on each a vast body of various and recondite information, applied to the point in question with great acuteness and good sense, and conveyed in very easy and spirited language. On the whole, though it is no more than natural and reasonable, that essays which apply to the daily actions, and the necessary belief of all Christians, should be preferred, in the daily studies of the greater number, to those which have reference to subordinate distinctions, and lead us through the thorny mazes of controversy; yet, as specimens of talent and acquirement, the two Dissuasives are, I conceive, not inferior to any of his most popular

productions; and it is even possible, that they will be read by many with less weariness, and a more sustained, though a different kind of pleasure, than the unmingled and almost interminable wilderness of sweets, which characterizes his earlier and less argumentative writings.

Nor are they only those immediately interested in the disputes between the Protestant and the Roman Catholics, who may find themselves amused and instructed by the manner in which Taylor discusses them, and derive abundant information and rational entertainment from the two pieces on Dissuasive. Whoever takes a pleasure in the history of Christianity, and of the human mind, in tracing the progress from small beginnings, of the most extensive and portentous changes; in estimating the amount of those corruptions which, in the lapse of ages, and from various causes, have been introduced into doctrines and practices the most simple and sacred; and in observing, nevertheless, even amid the greatest spread of those corruptions, how strangely the providence of God has raised up eminent persons to bear witness against them;—will find the time very profitably and agreeably employed, which he bestows on Taylor's controversial writings.

There is a trifling error in the beginning of his introduction to the second part, which would, in another person, have been hardly worth notice; but

which I should not have expected to meet with in one who, like Taylor, had paid a more than common attention to the works of the Rabbins.

"When our blessed Saviour," he tells us, "was casting out the evil spirit from the poor demoniac in the Gospel, he asked his name, and he answered, 'My name is Legion, for we are many.'—Legion is a Roman word and signifies an army, as Roman signifies the men," &c.* It is singular that he had overlooked the fact that "legion" among the Jews, was the name usually given to the individual who commanded a large body of soldiers, and answered, in fact, to "general," or "colonel." It was therefore properly assumed by the single spirit who spoke in the name of the rest, and exercised authority over them; whereas, had it been used as a noun of multitude, it would have been, not "my name," but "ours."—The observation is of some use, in clearing up an expression of Scripture; but Taylor's witticism will, in consequence, fall to the ground.†

In his Great Exemplar, while commenting on the second commandment, he had said, "God forbade to the Jews the very having and making images and representments, not only of the true God, or of false and imaginary deities, but of visible creatures."‡ In

* Vol. x. p. 265.

† See Buxtorf., Lex. Talmud., p. 1123, ad voc. לגיון, and Schleusner, ad voc. Λεγεων. 2.

‡ Vol. iii. p. 14.

the second part of the Dissuasive, he says, on the contrary,—" Neither the second commandment, nor the ancient fathers in their commentaries on them, did absolutely prohibit all making of images; but all that was made for religious worship, and in order to adoration, according as it is expressed in him, who, among the Jews, collected the negative precepts which Arias Montanus translated into Latin; the second of which is, ' signum cultûs causa ne facito;' the third, ' simulachrum divinum nullo pacto conflato;' the fourth, ' signa religiosa nulla ex materia facito.' "*

Of the two opinions, it is hardly necessary to observe, that the latter is shewn, by the brazen serpent of Moses, and by the cherubim, oxen, and lions of Solomon, to be the ancient and true explication of the second commandment.

The letters to persons seduced or tempted to the Church of Rome, are not ill adapted to their object, but offer nothing which calls for particular observation here. One which accompanies them, and stands second in the series, to a lady converted from the Church of Rome to that of England, is, however, highly characteristic of its author, as endeavouring to recal the attention of his pupil from polemics, to practical religion and morality, and evincing that he had been chiefly anxious to make her a Protestant,

* Vol. xi. p. 153.

in order that she might be more pure, more holy, more eminently Christian, in proportion as her mode of faith was rational and apostolical.

The "Discourse of Confirmation" is preceded by a dedication to the Duke of Ormond, in which the author, after some lamentations over the dilapidated and divided state of the Irish church, advances, with apparent approbation, a whimsical fancy of "some wise and good men," that, "when baptized Christians are confirmed and solemnly blessed by the bishop, then it is that a special angel guardian is appointed to keep their souls from the assaults of the spirits of darkness."—This solemn trifling (for, in our profound ignorance of the world of spirits, it is nothing more,) is not calculated to give a very advantageous impression of the work which it introduces; and, in fact, I cannot consider it as a favourable specimen of his genius.

In the introduction, however, is a passage of no common eloquence,—where, while describing the assistance of the Holy Ghost, as supplied to Christians, he compares the new to the old creation, and describes the Spirit as a second time "moving upon the face of the waters."—"By him we live, in him we walk, by his aids we pray, by his emotions we desire: we breathe, and sigh, and groan, by him: he helps in all our infirmities, and he gives us all our strengths: he reveals mysteries to us, and teaches us all our duties: he stirs us up to holy desires, and

he actuates those desires: he maketh us to will and to do of his good pleasure."*

The work itself consists of seven sections, in which he undertakes to prove, the divine institution of the rite of confirmation;—its perpetuity;—its practice by the primitive churches;—its exclusive administration by bishops;—its essential parts, which he defines to be prayer and imposition of hands;—its blessed effects, and the preparation necessary for it.

To shew that confirmation is a divinely instituted rite, and to be proved from Scripture, he alleges, first, the descent of the Holy Ghost on our Lord, not during, but *after* his baptism; and secondly, the words of Christ to Nicodemus, declaring the necessity of baptism, "by water and the Spirit."

Neither of these can, as I conceive, be esteemed conclusive. The former is no more an example for Christians, than any other of the long train of wonders and displays of supernatural power, which accompanied and established his divine mission, can be said to be examples to us.—If it proved any thing with respect to the manner of initiating new members into his mystical body, it would rather prove that the grace of the Holy Ghost was, without any further outward ceremony, to be a necessary consequence of baptism; and this, in fact, is all which those expressions of the fathers can be fairly said to imply,

* Vol. xi. p. 229.

which Taylor quotes as agreeing in his application of the miracle.

The second is, at first sight, more plausible, since our Saviour is, throughout his discourse with Nicodemus, impressing on the mind of the Jewish elder, the necessity of an entrance into his religion, by the public and usual rites of initiation. But the fact that confirmation was really one of those rites, will yet remain to be proved; and, as regeneration by the Holy Ghost is on all hands allowed to be the consequences of baptism, by itself, and even where no confirmation is superadded,—the expression is more naturally understood, and has been, in fact, so understood by the greater part of orthodox commentators, as merely declaratory of the spiritual benefits which were to follow the external rite of water.

There is, indeed, a dangerous consequence attendant on both Taylor's arguments, that, by limiting the gift of the Holy Ghost to confirmation, he makes baptism, taken by itself, of none effect, or, at most, of no further effect, than as a decent and necessary introduction to that which would be, on this hypothesis, the main and distinctive consignation of a Christian. To this objection Taylor himself was not insensible; and he endeavours to escape from it, by a still more dangerous admission, that confirmation is, really, as generally necessary as baptism or the Lord's Supper; which is, in fact, to contradict the express doctrine of our church, and formally to elevate it to the rank

of a sacrament.* How little he is borne out in such doctrines by the figurative expressions of the fathers, *when speaking of baptismal regeneration*, will appear from a reference even to those passages on which he relies. And how unnecessary such a novel hypothesis is to the obligation and importance of the ceremony in question, may appear from the far better arguments which he afterwards produces in its favour; from the known practice of the apostles, in the case of the Samaritan converts; and from the fact, that imposition of hands is classed by St. Paul among the fundamental doctrines of Christianity.†

That confirmation was not a temporary rite, or to lose its inward and ordinary blessing when the visible and miraculous gifts were withdrawn, which, in the first ages of the church, attended it, he proves from the analogy of other external rites, which had equally, in the first ages, extraordinary effects and miraculous consignations, but which, as in the case of preaching, prayer, &c., are allowed by all parties to be still necessary, though such obvious and wonderful fruits are no longer to be anticipated from them.

The ordinary and internal graces of the Spirit are promised, as he observes, to all ages of the church; and though our consignation is by a secret power, and the work is within,—"it does not therefore follow, that the external rite is not also intended," wherever that consignation is spoken of in Scripture.

* Vol. xi. pp. 244, 245. † Hebrews, vi. 1, 2.

"For the rite is so wholly for the mystery, and the outward for the inward, and yet, by the outward, God so usually and regularly gives the inward, that as no man is to rely upon the external ministry, as if the 'opus operatum' would do the whole duty; so no man is to neglect the external, because the internal is the more principal. The mistake in this particular hath caused great contempt of the sacraments and rituals of the church, and is the ground of the Socinian errors in these questions."*

That it was the uniform custom of the primitive church, and every where (except, perhaps, in Egypt, where he does not satisfactorily get rid of a strong testimony of St. Ambrose,) confined to the ministration of the bishop alone; that the essential parts of the rite are prayer, and imposition of hands,—and that the use of oil, though very ancient, is of ecclesiastical institution only, he proves with sufficient clearness in the three following sections. In the sixth, he ably, though in a simple and unambitious style, states the spiritual benefits of which confirmation is the outward and appointed means,—and, in the last, discusses the proper age and preparation for the ceremony.

In speaking of the proper age of candidates, he holds an opinion at variance with the usual practice of the Church of England, which is seldom to admit

* Page 254.

them to the solemn rite, till they are fourteen or fifteen years of age. He, on the contrary, recommends receiving them much earlier,—"the sooner the better, I mean, after that reason begins to dawn;" provided only that "the children be catechized, and well instructed in the fundamentals of religion."

He proceeds, with an earnest recommendation of the ancient custom of catechizing: in which he observes, by the way, that what is called *exorcism*, in the ancient church, was not, as is vulgarly supposed, an attempt to eject the devil out of innocent children, but that the exorcist was only another word for *catechist*;—and he then winds up his argument with a short and energetic peroration, on the blessings derived from, and the obligations attached to, an attendance on the rite which he has thus vindicated.

On the whole, the learning and piety of this little tract are not unworthy of Taylor, and he deserves, at least, the praise of having made out his point satisfactorily. But, except this learning and this piety, there is, perhaps, scarcely any thing else in the Essay on Confirmation, which would mark it as his writing. He has not, indeed, slept over his task; but it cannot be said that he has drawn his bow to the full extent of his usual force and vigour. And we shall be, perhaps, the more struck with this inferiority, if we compare it with the little Essay on Friendship, which follows next in the present series;

and which may be considered, without impropriety, as the earliest of his casuistic writings.

Of the lady to whom it is addressed I have already spoken; and she, certainly, deserves some credit for having suggested such a theme to Taylor, inasmuch as it was calculated, more than most others, to elicit the fires of his peculiar eloquence. It was a topic, also, on which his good sense and practical wisdom (of which qualities few men of equal genius have had a larger share), were likely to furnish very valuable rules, for the maintenance of affection in its just temper; for the increase and preservation of our interest in the breast of the beloved individual; and for the subjection and devotion of even our best and strongest feelings, to that common Father, from whom all pure affection flows.—Accordingly, he has produced a splendid and powerful essay, which, though the fair and enthusiastic Orinda should seem to have preferred the forgotten one of Mr. Francis Finch, will not appear, to the generality of readers, to derogate from the high character of his greater and more laboured performances.

He begins, however, with a paradox, of which I am not sure that it does not rest on a quibble. He tells his correspondent, that friendship, in the sense under which we commonly use the term,—"is not so much as named in the New Testament;" and he accounts for this by saying, that "the greatest love, and the greatest usefulness,

and the most open communication, and the noblest sufferings, and the most exemplar faithfulness, and the severest truth, and the heartiest counsel, and the greatest union of mind, of which brave men and women are capable," are, under the Christian term of charity, potentially due from us to all mankind; and directly, therefore, opposed to that affection, which is "like the sun peeping through a chink," or "his beams drawn into the centre of a burning glass."

That charity, in this sense, is not friendship, is most true, since it is the general principle of affection, of which friendship is an application to particular instances, in compliance with that imperfection of our nature, and those circumstances of society, which limit our active affections, and our confidential intercourse (like our alms, and our personal intercessions), to those with whom we are brought in contact, and who only are, therefore, susceptible of our service or our tenderness.

But this limitation, and particular application of the common principle, he himself allows to be natural and necessary; and he admits, that the good and glorious Person, who, in his human nature, has given us the most perfect example of the best application and employment of all our natural affections, has left us instances, in his own conduct, of that condensed and distinctive love, which he felt, for one of the apostles, in a greater degree, than for the

remaining eleven; and for the family of Lazarus, more than for the great mass of those who believed on him.

This, which the Christian Scriptures call *charity*, as being a particular application of the general grace, he admits, in philosophy, is called "*friendship*." But if the thing be named, though under a different term, in the New Testament, his assertion, that it does not occur, must resolve itself into a quibble only. And, in fact, though we have translated ἀγαπαω, and ἀγαπη, perhaps, too indiscriminately, by the common and genuine term of "love," and the almost technical term of "charity,"—it would be easy to shew, not only that the corresponding word in Hebrew is applied to the "friendship" of David and Jonathan, but that ἀγαπαω is used in the New Testament, as strictly synonymous with the proper Greek term of friendship, φιλεω, and that it is applied, both there, and in the classical writers, to express not only "love" in its exalted sense, but a much slighter degree of "liking," or "approbation."*

His doctrine, however, that friendship is the application to a particular person, of the love which, but for the weakness of our nature, we should feel for all, is strictly philosophical, as well as Christian; and there are few passages in his works more characteristic, more appropriate, or more beautiful, than the following illustration of the general principle.

* 1 Sam. xx. 17. Schleusner, ad voc. Αγαπαω.

"Thus, the sun is the eye of the world, and he is indifferent [impartial] to the Negro, or the cold Russian; to them that dwell under the Line, [qu. *Pole?*] and them that stand near the tropics; the scalded Indian, or the poor boy that shakes at the foot of the Riphean hills. But the flexures of the heaven and the earth, the conveniency of abode, and the approaches to the north and south respectively, change the emanations of his beams; not that they do not pass always from him, but that they are not equally received below; but by periods and changes, by little inlets and reflections, they receive what they can. And some have only a dark day and a long night from him; snows and white cattle; a miserable life, and a perpetual harvest of catarrhs and consumptions, apoplexies and dead palsies. But some have splendid fires, and aromatic spices, rich wines, and well digested fruits, great wit, and great courage; because they dwell in his eye, and look in his face, and are the courtiers of the sun, and wait upon him in his chambers of the east. Just so it is in friendships: some are worthy, and some are necessary; some dwell hard by, and are fitted for converse; nature joins some to us, and religion combines us with others; society and accidents, parity of fortune, and equal dispositions, do actuate our friendships; which, of themselves, and in their prime disposition, are prepared for all mankind, according as any one can receive them."*

* Vol. xi. p. 304.

Having thus defined and explained the nature of friendship,—he goes on to observe, that "there may be a special friendship contracted for any special excellency whatsoever; because friendships are nothing but love and society mixed together, that is, a conversing with them whom we love; now, for whatsoever we can love any one, for that we can be his friend; and, since every excellency is a degree of amability, every such worthiness is a just and proper motive of friendship or loving conversation."

But all excellencies can only so far become the objects of friendship as they are or may be *advantageous to ourselves.* Even virtue itself, in the abstract, or as displayed towards God and mankind in general, though it be the best motive for esteem and honour, is not enough, he observes, "to make a man my *privado,* my special and particular friend;" but, if he be a *good man*—χρηστος ἀνηρ—a *kind* and *useful* and *amiable* person, he is then such an one, as "some will even dare to die for."

"If you suspect that this discourse can suppose friendship to be mercenary, and to be defective in the greatest worthiness of it, which is to love our friend for our friend's sake, I shall easily be able to defend myself; because I speak of the election and reasons of choosing friends. After he is chosen, do as nobly as you talk, and love as purely as you dream; and let your conversation be as metaphysical as your discourse: and proceed in this method till you

be confuted by experience; yet, till then, the case is otherwise when we speak of choosing one to be my friend. He is not my friend till I have chosen him or loved him; and, if any man inquires whom he shall choose, or whom he should love, I suppose it ought not to be answered, that we should love him who hath least amability; that we should choose him who hath least reason to be chosen. But, if it be answered, he is to be chosen to be my friend who is most worthy in himself, not he that can do most good to me, I say there is a distinction, but no difference; for he is most worthy in himself who can do most good; and, if he can love me too, that is, if he will do me all the good he can, or that I need, then he is my friend, and he deserves it."—"True and brave friendships are between worthy persons; and there is in mankind no degree of worthiness that is not also a degree of usefulness, and by every thing by which a man is excellent I may be profited: and because those are the bravest friends which can best serve the ends of friendships, either we must suppose that friendships are not the greatest comforts in the world; or else we must say, he chooses his friend best, that chooses such a one by whom he can receive the greatest comforts and assistances *."

Still this obligation to choose our friends for their aptness to give us the greatest help, comfort, or

* Pp. 310—312.

pleasure, does not lay on us the necessity of choosing always the *best*: You must not, he observes, choose a friend who is deficient in the essentials of friendship, who is not "honest and secret, just and true to a tittle; but if he be wise at all, and useful in any degree, and as good as you can have him, you need not be ashamed to own your friendships, though sometimes you may be ashamed of the imperfections of your friend."

Even "fancy and little partialities; a conformity of humours and proportionable loves, and the beauty of the face, and a witty answer," he admits of as circumstances which may, in the first instance, produce a liking; though he urges, with reason, that this platonic and fanciful regard will never be maintained at the rate of a real friendship, "unless it be fed by pure materials, by worthinesses which are the food of friendship."—"I will," he concludes, "when I choose my friend, choose him that is the bravest, the worthiest, and most excellent person; and then your first question is soon answered. To love such a person, and to contract such friendships, is just so authorised by the principles of Christianity as it is warranted to love wisdom and virtue, goodness and beneficence, and all the impresses of God upon the spirits of brave men."

Under the next head, that of the limits of friendship, he assigns no boundary to the affection and service which friend may shew to friend, but the

borders of vice and virtue,—a man may die for his friend, if that friend be a worthy and useful person; he may sacrifice his property for his friend, if he does not transgress against the duty which he owes to his natural relations; but he must not, like Pollux, kill the person who speaks slightingly of his friend, nor must he transgress the laws of God or man to serve him.

In the same section are some very sensible observations as to the difference between friendship and filial or fraternal love; on the circumstances which may render a friend more intimate than either a parent or a brother; though no friend, he forcibly urges, can prudently or lawfully take precedence of a wife or a husband.

"The reason is, because marriage is the queen of friendships, in which there is a communication of all that can be communicated by friendship; and it being made sacred by vows and love, by bodies and souls, by interest and custom, by religion and by laws, by common counsels and common fortunes; it is the principal in the kind of friendship, and the measure of all the rest. And there is no abatement to this consideration, but that there may be some allay in this as in other lesser friendships, by the incapacity of the persons. If I have not chosen my friend wisely or fortunately, he cannot be the correlative in the best union; but then the friend lives as the soul does after death: it is in the state of se-

paration, in which the soul strangely loves the body and longs to be reunited, but the body is an useless trunk, and can do no ministries to the soul, which therefore prays to have the body reformed and restored, and made a brave and fit companion: so must these best friends, when one is useless or unapt to the braveries of the princely friendship; they must love ever, and pray ever, and long till the other be perfected and made fit: in this case there wants only the body, but the soul is still a relative, and must be so for ever."

In the next inquiry,—"How friendships are to be conducted?"—he has given some very wise and useful, though moderate and indulgent advice, for the case of an intimacy between persons of different sexes; where "not only the interest of their religion, and the care of their honour, but the worthiness of their friendship, require that their intercourse be prudent and free from suspicion or reproach." Yet even here he does not enjoin an implicit deference to "the noises of people:" and he subjoins a spirited and affectionate eulogium of the female character, and its fitness for all the noblest duties of friendship.

He concludes his essay with some short rules of duty and prudence to be observed by one friend towards another, of which the practical wisdom is not inferior to the simplicity; but for which it is necessary to refer my readers to the work itself, if they

read the whole of which they will find the short labour well repaid *.

That which follows next is of far greater bulk and labour. The necessity of such works as the "Ductor Dubitantium" had, very plainly, its origin in those times, and among those sects of Christians with whom auricular confession and priestly absolution were regarded as the duty of every penitent; the preliminary of all celestial mercy.—When a body of many thousand persons, of various ages and all degrees of acquirement or capacity, were liable to become the depositaries of the most important or the most trifling secrets, and called on to pronounce authoritatively on the spiritual condition of all ranks and under all possible circumstances, it was absolutely necessary that the more skilful of these confidential monitors should lay down rules for the less learned; and that all precedents should be collected and preserved, which might lighten the labour, or guide the judgment, or diminish the responsibility, of the busy, the uninformed, the timid, or the diffident ministers of religion.

And this necessity became the greater in proportion as the abuses of the Romish superstition were multiplied. While the rules of faith were drawn from the apostles' creed, and the rules of conduct from the ten commandments: while the terms of

* Note ZZ.

church communion were easy and perspicuous, and the church had laid no further burthen on her members than those few and simple customs and ceremonies which derived their sanction from the apostles and from Christ; there was the less occasion to wander from so wide a road, and, from one so plain, whoever wandered was more easily detected and censured.

But, when the commandments or inventions of men were taught under the same sanction with the doctrines of inspiration; when prohibitions of things lawful or indifferent were multiplied without warrant or necessity; and states of life and society in themselves unnatural were grafted on a creed which was at first the perfection of natural religion; the feelings of men revolted against rules thus arbitrarily imposed; while their consciences were not sufficiently enlightened to make them satisfied that their revolt was innocent. The multitude of cases was thus greatly increased, which sought at the hands of the confessor, for ghostly counsel and comfort; and so inevitably does the commission of one supposed fault lead to others, that the habitual transgression of the commandment of the church seldom failed to carry men further into a neglect of the divine commandments also; till offences against general morality became more numerous, in proportion as the breach of ecclesiastical laws became more inevitable.

It had been thus, in more ancient times, with the Jewish doctors, whose "hedge" of traditions and ceremonies * had only served to encroach on and block up the path of duty; and whose volumes of casuistry are sufficiently bulky, though they had not, among their institutions, so fruitful a mother of quibbles as the practice of confession.

Among Christians of the Romish church, it may be easily understood how the indulgence of some spiritual guides;—the ostentatious ingenuity of others;—the desire, in a third party, of conciliating wealthy and powerful sinners;—and, in a fourth, the refinements of an impure curiosity, excited and employed by a great majority of the cases which came before them,—would produce a plentiful harvest of distinctions, provisions, abatements and aggravations, sufficient, when duly stated, to distort to almost any extent, the features of almost any action or course of actions.

What mischief had, in this respect, been done by the Jesuit confessors and casuists, may be seen in several parts of Taylor's Dissuasive from Popery, and still more in the spirited invective of Pascal. But the matter grew still worse, when cases of conscience were brought into courts of law; when the institutions of penance and ecclesiastical censure, as managed in the Church of Rome, and as commuted

* "Ponere sepem

for by pecuniary fines, became the subjects of legal argument, and of that perverse ingenuity which a counsel is generally expected to exert on behalf of his client.

In civil courts, indeed, that ingenuity can produce but little harm; since it is avowedly exercised on the laws of man alone, and since the eternal sanctions of morality remain entire and unbroken, whatever temporal consequences are incurred or averted by the parties. But the misfortune was, that the spiritual tribunal professed to exert an influence beyond the present world; and when an equal danger of purgatory was incurred by a breach of a canon as of a commandment, and when the consequences of both the one and the other might be got rid of by a flaw in the indictment; it is less strange that offences were multiplied, than it is that they were so far repressed by the general good feelings of mankind, and that efficacy which yet remained in the obscured and neglected Gospels. But as offences multiplied, distinctions multiplied also; and we cannot wonder, therefore, that the very title of the canon law was "Concordantia Discordantiarum;" that "the easy commandment was wrapped up in uneasy learning; and, by the new methods, a simple and uncrafty man could hardly be wise unto salvation." "There is a wood before your doors, and a labyrinth within the wood, and locks and bars to every door in that labyrinth; and, after all, we are

like to meet with unskilful guides; and yet, of all things in the world, in these things an error is the most intolerable *."

But, while such had been the original occasion, and such the gradual but appalling progress of casuistry in the Church of Rome; it was not very apparent why the reformed churches, who had shaken off the accumulated load of ages, were again, without the same occasion, to begin to rebuild the fabric. Why, when their rule was brought back to its primitive simplicity, and the Scriptures which contained that rule were made accessible to all; when they had restricted the lash of ecclesiastical censure to a very few, and those very palpable and notorious cases of public scandal; and when, by leaving confession optional, they had cut off the necessity which made every parish minister a casuist,—why were they to darken what was so plain by needless explanation, or encourage a nearer approach to forbidden things by an attempt to define the precise limits of the prohibition?

That first thoughts are generally best, in cases of duty, has been observed by Taylor as well as by Paley. I have myself had sufficient experience of what are generally called scruples, to be convinced that the greater proportion of those which are submitted to a spiritual guide, are nothing more than artifices by which men seek to justify themselves in

* Vol. xi. pp. 353, 354

what they know to be wrong; and I am convinced that the most efficacious manner of easing a doubtful conscience is, for the most part, to recal the professed penitent from distinctions to generals, from the peculiarities of his private concerns to the simple words of the commandment. If we are too curious, we only muddy the stream; but the clearest truth is, in morals, always on the surface.

Still there were yet remaining, in the two first centuries after the Reformation, circumstances, (besides the precedent of the Roman church, and the secret regret of the influence formerly enjoyed by their order, which, however unsuspected by themselves, was likely to actuate the more learned of the Protestant clergy,) which might well impress on the mind of Taylor and of many of his contemporaries, the opinion that a work of casuistry was a desideratum in the Church of England, and its want a defect which might be with reason objected to that church by its adversaries.

There were, probably, more genuine and conscientious scruples at that time busy in the public mind than are likely to occur at present. The religious ferment, and the spirit of inquiry which it excited, which accompanied the reformation of religion, had been kept up by the Puritans, and after them by the Independents, with unfailing force and activity: and though the Reformation in England had been conducted on wiser and more moderate

principles, and had, in fact, overlooked all trifles in order to make the better clearance of essential abuses; yet had the minds of men been drawn, by the weakness of some, and the mischievous arts of others, to trifles and external circumstances, in a degree of which our present religious divisions afford us no conception.

There are few even of the dissenting divines who now preach against, there are fewer still who really care for, the peculiarities of the established church in its habits and ceremonies. Its liturgy is praised almost by all. Yet not avowed dissenters only, but no small party of those who had been episcopally ordained, and appointed to offices within the limits of the establishment, were, in the days of Charles the First, conscientiously miserable at the thought of standing in a surplice, or saying any prayer but of their own composing. Many thousand good and pious men, and probably a still greater number of women, were distressed between the fear of schism, and the crime of attending in a place of worship where even the minutest particular was not warranted by some explicit text of Scripture.

The wickedness of mince-pies and plum-porridge, and the question how far these abominations might be winked at, when believers were unequally yoked with a prelatist, agitated many well-meaning minds; while there were others, of a contrary faction, who looked with horror on the marriage of second cousins,

and were seriously troubled if, during the forty days, any flesh-meat was seen in their houses.

The law of Moses, the question how far it was repealed or how far it still subsisted in the particulars of blood, perhaps of pork, and certainly of a sabbatical rest on the Lord's day, was also a frequent cause of secret distress or domestic litigation; while on the other hand, individuals were not wanting who, despising all ordinances, exclaimed against their kindred and neighbours as legalists and foolish Galatians.

It is possible that, in the present age of sects, some of these wild tenets may still be active and mischievous; but the greater part of our divisions arise from other causes; and, above all, the habits of the time lead men rather to decide their scruples for themselves and in their own way, than to recur to their spiritual pastors.

But to how great an extent such feelings then prevailed, may be learned from the fact that, during the time that the celebrated Dr. Owen was dean of Christchurch, a regular office for the satisfaction of doubtful consciences was held in Oxford. How long it continued, or what were the numbers that resorted to it, I am not informed. It possibly was of the shorter duration from the ludicrous name of "scruple-shop," which was given it by the younger students.

Nor was it a slight aggravation of the mischief that the emissaries of the Church of Rome were, in the meantime, always active; ready to remind every uneasy conscience of the rest and relief to be found

within the pale of their communion; vaunting the acuteness and learning of their doctors, and the comfort of their absolution; and obtaining the more abundant draughts of fishes the more the waters were troubled.

Under such circumstances, it was an expedient which would naturally occur to the clergy of the episcopal church, to meet both Puritans and Papists at their own weapons, and to supply, from a rational and legitimate source, that satisfaction to restless spirits which the others professed to furnish by a false stimulus, or a still more deceitful opiate.

Accordingly, the work now executed by Taylor had been projected by many eminent persons before him. Besides some writings of the same sort by different Lutheran divines, (who, as still retaining, before the administration of the sacrament, a shadow of the old confessional, have more reason than those of the English church for affixing a value to such assistances), the excellent Bishop Hall had made a beginning which he did not live to complete; and Sanderson, whose lectures "de conscientiâ," had shewn very considerable talent in the casuistical part of morality, was urged by Charles the First, in his last attendance on him, to employ the remainder of his life in writing cases of conscience*.

It was not, however, to the detail of individual

* Walton's Life of Sanderson. Wordsworth, Eccles. Biog. vol. v. p. 487.

scruples that Taylor gave up his learning and genius. This, indeed, had been the usual practice of previous writers on the same subject. The Romish casuists, at least, (for the Lutherans I only know through the notices of them in Michaelis and in Taylor himself,) have contented themselves, for the most part, with filling their enormous volumes with cases, sometimes classed, indeed, under general heads, but not often submitted to any general or steady principles; a wilderness of precedents, of which (as they were rather selected for curiosity than for their frequent occurrence,) hardly a twentieth part could be expected to be really useful.

Taylor, on the other hand, has introduced his cases as illustrations and examples only, and by far the greater part of his work is devoted to the exposition of general principles, in which, with far more learning, and perhaps, (the time at which he wrote considered,) with equal originality, but with a clearness of arrangement and expression altogether much inferior, he has preceded in the same track the labours of Tucker and of Paley.

To give a regular analysis of so extensive a work, would be either to repeat the table of contents, or materially to exceed the bounds of a critical essay. I shall, therefore, content myself with offering to the reader a very slight outline of the plan, selecting only those parts for further comment, which, for their acuteness, their curiosity, their eloquence, or some-

times even their erroneous nature, appear to me to call for such a distinction.

After a preface, in which the importance and necessity of the attempt is throughout assumed, and which is chiefly directed against the sophistry and interminable length of his Romish predecessors, he has divided his work into four books, each containing several long chapters.

In the first, he defines the nature of conscience, its uses, and their impediments, pointing out the different characteristics of a "right or sure conscience," — a conscience confident in error, — a "probable or thinking," — a "doubtful," and a "scrupulous conscience." Of all these, his definitions, though a little overlaid with words and misplaced eloquence, are distinct and forcible, and his illustrations often very fine and appropriate.

Such a one occurs where he has been observing that, "we cannot take any direct account of the greatness or horror of a sin by the affrightment of conscience."

"For," he proceeds, "it is with the affrightments of conscience as it is in temporal judgments; sometimes they come not at all, and, when they do, they come irregularly, and, when they do not, the man does not escape." — "But as he who is not smitten of God, yet knows he is always liable to God's anger, and, if he repents not, it will certainly fall upon him hereafter; so it is in conscience. He that fears not,

hath never the *less* cause to fear, but oftentimes a greater, and therefore, is to suspect and alter his condition, as being of a deep and secret danger; and he that does fear, must alter his condition, as being highly troublesome. But, in both cases, conscience does the work of a monitor and a judge. In some cases, conscience is like an eloquent and fair-spoken judge, which declaims not against the criminal, but condemns him justly: in others, the judge is more angry, and affrights the prisoner more; but the event is still the same. For, in those sins where the conscience affrights, and in those in which she affrights not, (supposing the sins equal, but of differing natures), there is no other difference, but that conscience is a clock, which in one man strikes aloud and gives warning; and in another, the hand points silently to the figures, but strikes not; but by this he may as surely see what the other hears, that his hours pass away, and death hastens, and after death comes judgment*!"

The rules which he gives to distinguish a true peace of conscience, which he defines to be "a rest after a severe inquiry," are full of holy and practical wisdom; as when he remarks that "peace of mind is not to be used as a sign that God hath pardoned our sins, but is only of use in questions of particular fact. — What evils have I done? — what good have I left undone?" This is a very useful caution to two

* Vol. xi. pp. 403, 404.

different classes of men, those who afflict themselves without knowing why, and those who are satisfied when they ought to be afflicted.

The rule of a right conscience, he expresses to be "the speculative determination of the understanding," and subjoins as the single necessary caution, "that we be as sure of our speculation as of any other rule which we usually follow, and that we do not take vain philosophy for true speculations." And, while establishing this assertion, he maintains at some length, and with much acuteness, the use of reason in matters of religion; answering the different objections which are ordinarily made against it, and proving that, though reason may not be able to render an account of mysteries which are but imperfectly revealed to us, yet, the authenticity of the revelation is, in the first instance, cognizable by reason; while, though things may be true which our reason cannot comprehend, yet what our reason rejects we cannot receive as revealed by God; so that "though right reason is not the positive and affirmative measure of any article, yet it is the negative measure of every one." Obedience of the understanding to God he acknowledges to be our undoubted duty; "but that," he observes, "is only when God speaks. But because we heard him not, and are only told that God did speak, — our reason must examine whether it be fit to believe them that tell us so."

In the course of this inquiry many interesting

corollaries occur, as to the question of two wills in God: — the conformity of reason and faith: — and the vanity of judicial astrology, which last he condemns not on the score of its supposed impiety and contradiction to Scripture, but as the instrument of imposture and delusion; and, therefore, against religion, not as an unlawful exercise of reason, but as mere folly and knavery, and on account of the "dangerous and horrid consequents which they feel, that run a-whoring after such idols of imagination."

His examination of mixed motives, and the censure which he passes on good actions when done from secular or incompetent arguments, are useful and well-founded; though, under this last head, and while discussing the incidental question, "whether it be lawful and ingenuous to go about to persuade a man to the belief of a true proposition, by arguments with which we ourselves are not persuaded?" he has made some admissions which a severe lover of truth will hardly allow to pass without reprobation.

An "*argumentum ad hominem*" is, indeed, perfectly allowable, which proceeds on the supposition, not upon the concession and granting of an error. But this, which is no more than taking a man on his own grounds, has no natural tendency to make him believe that I agree with him in that particular. The argument is good, because the premises are conventionally so; and the effect is not so much to convince a man of the truth of our inference, as to unsettle his

prejudices against that inference; and, by proving his own principles to be inconsistent, to make him the more ready to submit himself to ours.'

But the case is very different, when I use arguments which I know or believe to be bad, because "there may be something in my opponent that can make the argument to become perfect and effectual." This is like feeding a hungry man with chaff, because there may be some peculiarity in his digestion, which can extract its nutritive qualities.

If other competent judges have laid stress on such an argument, we may, indeed, advance it as theirs, and in deference to their authority. But, even here, it can hardly be allowed us to advance it without premising the caution that it is not our own opinion which we express, and that we therefore can lay no stress on it. And, as arguments thus brought forwards are likely to be of little service to our cause, it is, apparently, both wiser and better to confine ourselves to such arguments only as are really satisfactory to our understanding *.

This, however, will, of course, not conclude against our stating as possible, or probable, such consequences as, though they do not certainly follow from the premises, may yet, without contradiction, do so. But the *premises* are, by their very nature and employment, presumed to be truths; nor can we honestly

* Vol. xi. pp. 483, 485, 488.

use any thing as a premise, which we do not either believe to be true, or, at least, state hypothetically.

He speaks more justly, when he will not allow of any distinction between a man's public conscience as a magistrate, and his private conscience as an individual*; and where he observes that "conscience hath power in obligations and rules, but not so much nor so often in permissions†." Thus, a person may in no case do that which conscience forbids, but may not always go so far as she allows.

Under the head of "a probable or thinking conscience," he teaches, with great justice, that "a conscience that is, at first and in its own nature, probable, may be made certain by accumulation of many probabilities operating the same persuasion‡." And of this kind of "moral demonstration," he gives an instance in a magnificent sketch of the different probabilities on which a faith in Christianity is founded. Few of his most splendid passages in the most popular of his writings exceed some parts of this argument: as, when he speaks of the doctrine of Christ, "hunting the demons from their tripods,—their '*navels*,‖' their dens, their hollow pipes, their temples, and their altars;" as "flourishing, like the palm, by pressure; growing glorious by opposition; thriving by persecution, and demonstrated by objections§;" or

* P. 499. † P. 522. ‡ Vol. xii. p. 33.
‖ Delphi, called γης ὀμφαλος. § P. 56.

where, contrasting it with the local rites and restricted worship of the Jews, he says of the Christian religion, that it is "as eternal as the soul of a man, and can no more cease than our spirits can die; and can worship upon mountains and in caves, in fields and churches, in peace and war, in solitude and society, in persecution and in sunshine, by day and by night, and be solemnized by clergy and laity in the essential parts of it; and is the perfection of the soul, and the highest reason of man, and the glorification of God*."

There are many other valuable principles laid down in this part of his work, of which a few are all that I can instance. Such are his positions, that "Reason weighs more than authority;" that "a multitude of authorities, when they are deducible from one or a few, add nothing to the strength of that on which they themselves rest: that authority alone is no sufficient proof after a new doubt has been started; and, that an apparent interest in the person who maintains a proposition is no more reason for disbelieving than for believing it†."

Some of his illustrations of a doubtful conscience, are not over delicate, or even decent, and some of his positions dangerous. Of the first description, is a very injudicious quotation from Toletus; and of the second, his admission that private evil may be done

* Vol. xii. p. 64. † Pp. 91, 99, 108.

by public men and for the public necessity; which, though with many limitations, and in very few instances, as in that of war, the employment of spies, &c., it may possibly be true, yet is hardly to be allowed in any instance without peril. It is, however, a very just and reasonable observation, which he makes in the same chapter, that "positive and temporary" ought to give way to higher duties. Such, also, is his distinction between a doubting and a scrupulous conscience, that "against the first a man may not work, but against the second he may." All his advice, indeed, to scrupulous persons, is excellent*.

His second book begins with an examination of the law of nature, which he defines to be "the universal law of mankind, concerning common necessities, to which we are inclined by nature, incited by consent, prompted by reason, but [which] is bound upon us only by the command of God."

Its two sanctions he defines to be fear and love: the first, of a bad conscience, a bad name, or the other penal consequences which Providence and society inflict on guilt; the next is not so much born with us, as implanted in us by education, and by the hopes of future reward which God has, in revelation, held out to us.

To the law of nature thus defined, he assigns an authority superior to all positive institutions, though

* P. 183 et seq.

its laws, (as he observes,) may be capable of interpretation, and may be allayed by equity, piety, and necessity.

In speaking of contracts, he allows that an unlawful or impossible contract cannot hold; but he materially limits the permission given by the lawyers to annul contracts made under false impressions*. When a contract is made against the positive institutions of man, in points where the law of God is silent; though the parties may have sinned in entering into it, yet "the after actions, being no sins, cannot be invalidated;" and even "if the contract be made against a divine law," if it can be fulfilled on our part without sin, and "the contract be extrinsical to the nature of the sin incurred," the contract is binding, though its occasion is to be repented of†.

In this last case, he agrees with Paley, (Moral Philosophy, b. xi. c. 5,) and has, to all appearance, taken a clearer view of the moral obligation of contracts than Sanderson did on a similar question. It is probable that Sanderson judged differently, from the same sense of the inexpediency of such contracts becoming general, which has induced Paley, inconsistently enough, to reject his own principle, (where it ought, *à fortiori*, to hold good, and does hold good, according to Taylor,) in the case of a promise made to a robber‡.

* Vol. xii. pp. 256, 257. † P. 260 ‡ Vol. xiv. p. 396.

To the law of nature, in general, the Christian law succeeds, which he describes as "The law of Nature, or of all mankind, as it is commanded, digested, and perfected by our Supreme Lawgiver Jesus Christ*."

This, as the great rule of conscience, he distinguishes from the Mosaic law, which has entirely ceased to bind, any further than as it contains some particulars which belong to the moral law, or law of nature. From the list of those particulars he does not exclude the prohibition of eating blood; which he interprets, with good reason, not to mean the use of black puddings, but the hateful practice, common in the east and among barbarous nations, of devouring the members of a living creature†. But the judicial law he excludes in all its branches, more particularly in that which was then the subject of frequent discussion, the intermarriage of persons within the degrees of consanguinity. On this head, he exposes the unwarranted additions to the Mosaic prohibition which had been made, in the case of cousins, brothers' widows, &c., by the Romish canonists; and, on the whole, appears to take nearly the same view of the question as has been since taken by Michaelis: though he does not state, so plainly as Michaelis has done, the reasons which have, in all ages and countries, made some prohibitions necessary; and the local and temporary inconveniences

* Vol. xiii. p. 280. † Vol. xiii. p 290 et seq.

which have obliged human lawgivers to extend, in some instances, those prohibitions still further*.

The Decalogue he refuses to consider as a perfect digest of the law of nature; inasmuch as our duty extends to many particulars which are not expressed on those tables. "It was intended," he conceives, "as a digest of all those moral laws in which God would expect and exact the obedience of the Jewish nation, leaving the perfection and consummation of all unto the time of the Gospel†."

Here, I conceive, he goes too far; inasmuch as, though he insists on the violence which is necessary to reduce all the different parts of a Christian's duty to these ten principal heads, it is certain that this has been, and is done with sufficient exactness for any practical purpose; and that he himself, in his exposition of the ten commandments, has ably and eloquently accomplished it. Nor is it true, as his hypothesis seems to suppose, that no other and more express moral laws were given to the Jews than these commandments. To give alms to the poor; to help their enemy whose beast had fallen under his load; to pray for the peace of the land whither they were led captive; to eat no living animal, which, as he himself allows, is part of the moral law:—all these laws are not only implied in the Decalogue, but

* Michaelis, Law of Moses, c. vii. Vol. iii. p. 39 et seq. Smith's Translation. Note (AAA.)

† Vol. xiii. p. 355.

explicitly laid down in different parts of the Mosaic volume; and it would be very difficult to instance any particular of natural law, strictly so called, to which the Jews were not obliged as well as ourselves, though the stream of the commandments had been disturbed and defiled by their rabbins, and though the Son of God, in his sermon on the mount, and by the still stronger lesson of his example, has vindicated them from corruption, and held them up a second time, and more clearly and gloriously than before, to our obedience and imitation.

Taylor is correct, however, in his inferences: "That we acknowledge Christ to be our Lord and Master, our Lawgiver and Teacher; that we understand the ten commandments according to his commentary."—"That we expect not justification by our conformity to the Decalogue."—"That we endeavour to go on to perfection, not according to the pattern which Moses, but which Christ shewed on the mount;" and "that we do not think it sufficient to live according to nature, but that we live according to grace, that is, the measures of reformed nature*." And he himself has, in fact, abandoned whatever was dangerous in his position simply taken, when he admits that all the precepts of morality "were potentially in the great commandment;" and that "there are the same general lines of religion,

* Vol. xiii. p. 355.

and of justice, in the Old Testament and the New, though the special and particular precepts are severally instanced by Christ and Moses."

He argues also more justly, when he says, that "every thing in the Decalogue is not obligatory on Christians," though he is unfortunate in the first instance which he produces, "that the having or making of images, though it be forbidden to the Jews in the second commandment, yet it is not unlawful to Christians*." Of this I have said enough already; and will here only observe, that it is strange that any man should hold such an interpretation of the commandment in question, who, at the same time, in order to prove it not obligatory on Christians, has instanced the golden lions of Solomon. Solomon, surely, was a Jew: he was also a very conspicuous person, and one whose faults are related in Scripture with due severity. If, then, he used such ornaments unblamed, it is plain, from this instance, as well as from Cæsar's image on the Jewish coin†, that the second commandment was interpreted by them, as by the generality of Protestants, to forbid idolatry only.

His observations on idolatry, however, and on the grievous presumption of picturing God, are excellent,

* P. 369.

† "The opinion, that the Jews admitted in no case the introduction of images, is ungrounded." Michaelis, Introd. to N. Test. Marsh, vol. i. p. 57.

and, I think, unanswerable. His opinion of the Sabbath and the Lord's day I have already had occasion to mention.

In the third chapter of the second book, which treats of the "interpretation and obligation of the laws of Christ," though there is much which is curious and valuable, there are few things which call for particular notice. Much of it, indeed, is more historical and controversial than casuistical, and refers to the great disputes which have always agitated the Christian commonwealth since the period of the reformation. On these Taylor thought with all Protestants; and an abundant store of weapons may be drawn from his armoury, for the future battles of the church. The maxims which strike me as most generally applicable, and, at the same time, most characteristic of their author, are, 1. that "all acts of virtue are to be preferred before the instruments of it, and that which exercises it before that which signifies it*." 2. The difference between positive and negative laws, that, namely, when any thing is commanded, the means of doing it are left to our choice; but, when any thing is forbidden, "all those things also, by which we come to that sin, are understood to be forbidden by the same law†."

"Every temptation," he observes, "is then certainly to be reckoned as a sin, when it is procured

* P. 498. † Vol. xiii. p. 6.

by our own act, whether the temptation ministers to the sin directly or accidentally;"—"and although the usual effect does not follow the instrument. For there is sometimes a fantastic pleasure in the remembrance of sin, in the approaches of it, of our addresses to it; and there are some men who dare not act the foul crime, who yet love to look on its fair face; and they drive out sin, as Abraham did Ishmael, with an unwilling willingness, (God knows):"—"and they look after it, and are pleased with the stories of it, and love to see the place of its acting."—"Now, they that go but thus far, and love to tempt themselves by walking on the side of the river,"—"they have given demonstration of their love of sin when they make so much of its proxy."

"But there are others, who have great experience of the vanity of all sin, and the emptiness and dissatisfaction that is in its fruition; and know [that] as soon as ever they have enjoyed it, it is gone, and that there is more pleasure in the expectation than in the possession; and therefore they had rather go towards it than arrive thither, and love the temptation better than the sin. These men sin with an excellent philosophy and wittiness of sinning; they love to woo always, and not to enjoy, ever to be hungry and sitting down to dinner, but are afraid to have their desires filled. But, if we consider what the secret of it is, and that there is in these men an immense love to sin, and a perfect adhesion to the

pleasure of it, and that they refuse to enter lest they should quickly pass through: and they are unwilling to taste it, lest they should eat no more; and would not enjoy, because they will not be weary of it; and will deny any thing to themselves, even that which they most love, lest, for a while, they should loathe their beloved sin,—we shall see reason enough to affirm these men to be the greatest breakers of the laws of Jesus Christ: though they only tempt themselves, and handle the instruments of sin; and, although these instruments serve nothing but the temptation, and the temptation does not serve the sin, whither in its own nature it is designed*."

At page 128 of this volume, he betrays what I should hardly have expected from him, an ignorance of a legend very generally known, and which is the oldest and most curious of all religious novels,—I mean, the "Acts of Paul and Thecla;" which he supposes, without any sufficient reason, to have been originally circulated as the work of St. Paul himself, and which he calls, (I know not why,) "the vision of Paul and Thecla." The work, in fact, could never have been pretended to be St. Paul's writing, without ascribing to the apostle an incredible degree of vanity, both personal and theological. Jerome, indeed, does not say that the Asiastic presbyter, who was its author, wished to father it on the saint

* Vol. xiii. pp. 8, 9.

as his own composition, but that he was degraded by St. John for having, though with a good intent, circulated an untrue history concerning an apostle. Nor has the history, as it has descended to our time, (whatever might have been the case with Jerome's copy,) any mention "baptizati Leonis*."

Here again he resumes, and resumes with admirable power and without intermixture of doubtful or extraneous matter, his favourite topic of secure and immediate repentance. He quotes St. Eucherius, saying, "Propound to yourself the example of the thief on the cross,—do as he did."—"Yes," proceeds Taylor, "we are too ready to do so, that is, to defer our repentance to the last, being encouraged by his example and success!—No! we do not as he did!—He did not defer his repentance and his faith unto the last; but, in the very first hour in which he knew Christ, in that very instant he did believe, and was really converted. He confessed Christ gloriously, and repented of his sins without hypocrisy; and, if we do so too, this question is at an end, and our repentance shall never be reproved†."

He concludes this second book with a splendid peroration on the measures and motives of a Christian's duty, exhorting him to do all his works "in faith and in love; in faith to make them accepted, though they be imperfect; in love, to make them as

* See Grabe, Spicilegium Patrum, vol. i. p. 81 et seq. † P. 194.

perfect as they can be."—"He that loves, will think every thing too little; and he that thinks so, will endeavour to do more, and to do it better."—"In the measures of the practice of this rule there is no difficulty, but what is made by the careless lives of Christians, and their lazy and unholy principles. At the rate as Christians usually do live, it is hard to know how, and in what instances, and in what degrees, our obedience ought to be more humble and more diligent than that of Moses's disciples. But they that love, will do the thing, and so understand the rule, 'Obedite et intelligetis:' Obey, and ye shall understand*."

In the first chapter of the third book, which treats of Human Laws and their obligation,—a case occurs, in illustration of Rule IV. that "a law founded on a false presumption does not bind the conscience," in which the Romish canonists seem to have given a more just decision than Taylor. Biretti, a Venetian gentleman, pretends a desire to marry Julia Medici, the daughter of a neighbour, with a purpose to seduce and desert her. A contract is made; but, before its execution, he gains his end, and, leaving her, marries another. The canonists declare the former contract, followed by congress, to be a marriage, and that he is bound to return to Julia. No, says Taylor, "if he did not lie with her 'affectu maritali,'"—"he was extremely impious and unjust;

* P. 229.

but he made no marriage; for *without mutual consent*, marriages are not made." Surely mutual consent is expressed by a public contract, as plainly as by any indication of a man's will that can be conceived. And, if Biretti were a hypocrite, it can be no reason why he should be free from the obligation implied by his own deliberate action! I cannot account for the obliquity of this verdict, but I could not pass it over lest my silence should seem like approbation.

The second chapter examines the power of princes to enact penal and tributary laws, and the obligation which rests on their subjects to obey such laws: in which he discusses the lawfulness or obligation of resisting a legal sentence; of prison-breaking; of self-chastisement; and of suicide. The first he admits of when the sentence is palpably unjust, and pronounced by an usurped authority. The second, in all cases where life or limbs are to be preserved; the third he confines to certain ecclesiastical cases; and the fourth he condemns in all, even when perpetrated by a virgin to save herself from pollution. Yet of such instances of self-murder he speaks with a sort of respectful pity, observing that he only knows that the fact is unlawful. "But how they shall fare in the other world, who, upon such great accounts, are tempted, is one of God's secrets which the great day will manifest*."

In the same chapter is an injudicious attempt to

* P. 346.

justify the supposed fraud of the children of Israel, in borrowing jewels of the Egyptians, without any intention of restoring them. He justifies the action by saying, that God commanded the Israelites so to spoil their enemies. But this is only removing the imputation from the Israelites to the Almighty; and though the Almighty may dispose of the property of his creatures as he pleases, it is not to be supposed that he would command any set of men to obtain their neighbours' goods by fraud. The true answer seems to be that which is given by Michaelis; that that though God knew that the Israelites would not return; and though he had communicated a share of his own prescience to Moses, yet the Israelites in general, as they had only asked for a short holiday from their toil, so they never expected or intended more, till the Egyptians, by thrusting them out of the land first, and afterwards by pursuing them with hostile intentions, had deprived themselves of all claim to whatever property they had previously intrusted to them*.

He has mis-stated the story in ancient Spanish history, of the princes of Lara or Carion, and the daughters of the Cid Rodrigo of Bivar†. The princes fought, not one with another, but both of them against two of the kindred of the Cid, and were

* Michaelis, Law of Moses, translated by Smith, art. clxxix. vol. iii. p. 44 et seq.

† P. 398.

beaten, as they well deserved. This is, however, a trifle; and the wonder is, rather, that in so multifarious reading, and amid references to all writers and languages, his facts are so generally accurate.

In discussing Laws of Tribute, though, when just, he allows them to be binding on the conscience of the subject, and to oblige him not only to a passive but an active obedience, he stoutly inveighs against the oppression frequently practised by sovereigns and senates. But, when he arrives at the question of obedience to kings, princes, and supreme civil powers, his doctrines are, as might be expected from a suffering loyalist of Charles the First's day, sufficiently devoted and unqualified. He assigns a greater degree of sacredness to kingly than any other government; he misrepresents the monarchy of Israel, which was, in fact, the most limited, except the Lacedæmonian, of any on record in ancient history; and he not only believes the legend of the martyred Thebæan legion, but insists, with much apparent exultation, on such an illustrious example of non-resistance. His arguments are, however, more to the purpose, when, following on the same side with Hooker, he justifies the power of the civil sovereign over persons and in causes ecclesiastical. They are directed both against the Roman Catholics and the Presbyterians; and, as well as the following chapter on church censures and canons, breathe throughout a moderate and Christian spirit, and are

well calculated to place in their true light those ecclesiastical powers, whose thunders sound so formidably in the Church of Rome, and against which, even in Protestant churches, many of the laity are strongly prejudiced, from a misconception of their limits, of their fitness, and their necessity. And I cannot help again observing, that here also he speaks as strongly as ever against the interference of the civil sword in matters of religion.

"This power,"—he is speaking of the commission given by Christ to his apostles and their successors,—"this power and these commissions were wholly ministerial, without domination, without proper jurisdiction, that is, without coaction; *it being wholly against the design of the religion that it should be forced*, and it being far removed from persons so disposed, so employed, so instructed, to do it." "And, therefore, one of the requisites of a bishop is—'he must be no striker:'—he had no arms put into his hand for that purpose; the ecclesiastical state being furnished with authority, but no power, 'auctoritate suadendi magis quam jubendi potestate.'—That which the ecclesiastics can do [in the case of church-censures,] is a suspension of their own act, not any power over the actions of other men: and, therefore, is but an use of their own liberty, not an exercise of jurisdiction. He does the same thing in sacraments as he does in preaching; in both he declares the guilty person to be out of the way to heaven, to be

obnoxious to the divine anger, to be a debtor of repentance: and in refusing to baptize an evil catechumen, or to communicate an ill-living Christian, he does but say the same thing. He speaks in one by signs, and in the other, he signifies by words." "This is 'judicium,' not 'jurisdictio,' a judging a man worthy or unworthy; which does not suppose a superiority of jurisdiction, but equals do it to their equals; though, in this, the clergy hath a superiority and a commission from God to do it*." Even of this moderate and natural right he condemns the public exercise, in the case of sovereign princes, who, as it is obviously unfit to subject them to open reproof or penance, so when private reproof and private warnings and entreaties have failed, they may, as he conceives, be admitted, if they command it, to the communion†.

This is, indeed, a difficult question, and one which is not likely to be a practical one. A wicked prince is not very often a hypocrite, and unless he be a hypocrite, it is not probable that he will force himself on rites for which he does not care. There is more courage and dignity in the conduct of St. Ambrose towards Theodosius; there is less danger to the public peace, and an almost equal certainty of obtaining the desired end, in the course recommended by Taylor.

The latter, however, makes another admission,

* P. 562. † P. 598.

which, if his life had been prolonged a few more years, might have involved him in a very serious difficulty of conscience; and would have divided him, if he had acted on it, from all the best and wisest of his own order and religion. "The unlawful proclamations and edicts of a true prince may be published by the clergy in their several charges*!" I wish I had not found this in Taylor; and I thank heaven that this principle was not adopted by the English clergy in 1687. Yet for Taylor many allowances may be made, and many excuses offered for this and the other ultra-monarchical features of his creed. Accustomed as he was to see and feel all the tyranny which then plagued the land, from those who, under the colour of freedom, had disturbed and enslaved their country, it was hardly to be expected that his attention could be equally alive to the possibility of the same evils occurring under a legitimate sovereign. And, above all, let it be remembered, that his inclination for absolute monarchy, if it were unwise, was, at least, not interested or servile; that if he carried too high the power of a lawful king, it was when that lawful king was in exile. The "Ductor Dubitantium," though published at the moment of the Restoration, was written and printed while no such event could be looked for; and when all that could be gained by an unlimited loyalty, was

* P. 598.

the suspicion or persecution of the ruling powers; imprisonment, fine, and aggravated indigence.

In examining the different institutions which are usually deduced from apostolical authority, he lays down as a general rule, though one, he admits, which can be very seldom applicable to practice, and which, without some cogent reason, it would be the height of presumption to put in force, that institutions merely of apostolical tradition, and relating to things in themselves indifferent, may be, by the authority of the church, in after times, dispened with. This liberty, however, he will not concede in the instances of the Lord's day, of the manner of administering the sacraments, or of episcopacy. The first he excepts not only on account of the fitness of the day itself, but because no other day can be preferred without a causeless neglect of apostolic authority; the others because they relate to the ministries of grace, which can only, under ordinary circumstances, be obtained or hoped for, when sought after in the appointed manner.

To the forty days Lent, he refuses the character of an apostolical institution. He shews, in fact, with great learning, and very convincingly, that the primitive Lent was not of forty *days*, but of forty *hours*, being confined to the Friday and Saturday immediately preceding Easter*. To the weekly fasts of

* Vol. xiv. p. 40.

Wednesday and Friday he assigns, however, a much greater antiquity, both being named by Clemens Alexandrinus and Tertullian; though neither can, on competent grounds, be ascribed to any commandment of the apostles.

From some expressions in Rule xv. p. 28, it is evident that he regretted, as Wesley afterwards did, the discontinuance of the ancient practice of baptizing by immersion, and even of dipping three times in honour of the Trinity. Like Wesley, he condemns the practice of sprinkling altogether, as contrary both to the analogy of the ceremony, the apostolic tradition, and the canons of the English and Irish church. How, in our climate, and with the contrary prejudices of the people, he would have settled his dispute with mothers and nurses, it is not very difficult to conjecture. The number of those neophytes who would be certified "well able to endure immersion," would, probably, be very limited.

Fond as he appears, from many passages in his writings, of chanting and psalmody, it may be suspected that he had no ear for music. It is singular to compare the reluctant permission which he gives to the use of organs in church, with the glow of feeling which their majestic tones excited in the breast of Milton*.

The Romish prohibition of marriage, and the

* Page 115. Compare "Il Penseroso."

sacred authority assigned by their canonists to the decrees of general councils, he exposes with nearly the same arguments, and an equal show of learning, as we have already seen him producing on the same topics in his two Dissuasives from Popery.

He closes the fourth chapter with a discussion of the case of subscription to ecclesiastical articles and forms of confession; which, he insists with becoming strictness, can only be done, in the instance of the English church, by those who sign in the sense of the imposers of the law, and who sincerely approve of that to which they thus express their consent. On the inexpediency of such subscriptions, "to any articles which are not *evidently* true and necessary to be professed," he expresses the same opinions which he had previously urged in his Liberty of Prophesying. Opinions they are so amiable in themselves, and proceeding from a spirit so enlarged and so thoroughly Christian, that our respect for the man is increased by them, even when we are not convinced by his arguments. Yet, it may be thought, as I have already endeavoured to shew, that a subscription, which would admit the Papist, the Protestant, the Arian, and the Anabaptist within the walls of the same establishment, would, in fact, be equivalent to no subscription at all; and that, though men may, beyond a doubt, be saved by the profession of the apostles' creed alone, yet of those who are to teach others some further examination may well be

accounted necessary. After all, Taylor's strongest arguments, both here and in the Liberty of Prophesying, apply less to such confessions in themselves than to the abuses to which they are liable; and, while the supporters of every confession will plead "that it contains, in their opinion, no uncertain or unnecessary articles," no Christian, that is worthy of the name, will deny what Taylor, in the next place, contends for, "that great regard be had, and great ease be done to wise and peaceable dissenters *."

His observations on parental authority, and on the "Interpretation, Diminution, and Abrogation of Human Laws," conclude this part of his subject.

The former, we perhaps, overlaid with too much unnecessary learning, and with obsolete precedents of the power exercised by fathers in the ruder ages of society; and, in the instance of marriage, he gives to parents a control too absolute over their children.

The latter contains some maxims of great truth and practical utility, as where he tells us, "There are some tacit exceptions in all laws that would be tyrannical." Again, "When the reason of commanding an action otherwise indifferent, does cease universally, the very negative ceasing, passes into the contrary of itself." — "The subject may still do it without sin, but the prince cannot, without

* Vol. xiv. page 163.

sin, command it to be done, when it is to no purpose." This rule, which Taylor applies to the trifling and absurd trials of obedience, which some of the modern Romish saints imposed on the monks in their convents, will apply equally to all cases of obsolete and vexatious regulation, such as, for the very love of authority, are sometimes too dear to men in power.

There is one passage, however, in this chapter, which must not be allowed to escape without strong and unqualified reprobation. I mean the manner in which he coolly instances, and, in some degree, even justifies, that horrible law of the Roman republic, which decreed that, if any single slave had killed his lord, all the slaves in the house should die for it*. Had Taylor considered twice, he could not have thus expressed himself. But of such hideous cruelty and injustice, our detestation ought to be instinctive and immediate.

The fourth and last book, which discusses "the nature and causes of all human actions, good and evil," is, perhaps, the ablest part of the work, as it is certainly the most generally and practically useful.

It is divided into two chapters of very unequal length, of which the first treats of efficient, the other of final causes.

The former is an illustration and expansion of the

* Page 236

principle, that the will of man is the seat of good and evil; and that actions are either good or evil according to the intention of the agent. He proves, however, not only that an act of the will alone is imputed, both by God and man, to good or evil; but that a virtual and interpretative consent of the will may make us sharers in the action of another; while the involuntary consequences of a voluntary action are imputed to us as parts of that action, and as if themselves directly chosen.

All these propositions, however, he guards with many distinctions; and introduces many interesting discussions on the legality of different actions or habits connected with, or illustrative of, his principles.

Thus, in his discussion of the rule that "the virtual and interpretative consent of the will is imputed to good or evil," besides some curious cases of "ratihabitation and confirmation," he enters into two different inquiries, as to the lawfulness of indulging a guest with an excess of wine, ourselves remaining sober; and whether it be lawful to play at cards or dice?

The first, as may be believed, he answers with an indignant negative. The second he treats more tenderly; though he, nevertheless, inclines to the opinion that all playing for money is dangerous, if not unlawful.

As diminutions of voluntary actions, he reckons

ignorance and fear: of which the first, when total and inevitable, he accounts a perfect annihilation of moral good or evil; the second only in those cases where the understanding is overpowered by the intensity of the danger.

Under the first head, he inquires what those things are of which a man may be innocently ignorant? what degree of diligence is required to exempt us from the charge of wilful or presumptuous ignorance? what is a probable ignorance? &c. He refuses the name of innocent ignorance to those professed Christians, who know not that which the universal church accounts necessary for salvation; though, of disputed points, he allows a man to doubt or to be ignorant with impunity. And he incidentally discusses the responsibility of children, at what time and according to what measures good or evil can be first imputed to them. Here, also, there are some expressions and illustrations which a reader of delicacy will wish away; but the whole work, it may be considered, is scarcely such as females, or very young persons, would study; and it is, after all, perhaps, a curse inseparable from works of casuistry, that questions of a certain kind are always more or less involved in them.

On the final causes of human actions, (this chapter concerning which is, in fact, an amplification of the principle that "Christianity is a religion of motives,") his rules are only three:—1. That, to constitute a

good action, the means and end must be symbolical. 2. That for actions, in themselves lawful, secondary motives are allowable. 3. That we are bound to regard the end and object of God's commandments, as well as the action commanded, in order to the end.

All these he inculcates with his usual force and eloquence, but they offer nothing which calls for any peculiar comment. He concludes with observing, that, "if our actions be designed well, they are likely to end well; for, in the service of God, a golden head shall never have the feet of clay. Nomini tuo da gloriam*!"

Many, perhaps the greater part, of his positions are illustrated by examples or by apologues; the former chiefly extracted from the volumes of the Romish casuists: the latter sometimes, as he tells us in his preface, containing real facts, and cases of conscience which had fallen under his own knowledge, conveyed under fictitious names and circumstances.

Among the first of these, is the famous story which Walpole has worked up into his tragedy of the "Mysterious Mother;" the scene of which has been often laid in England, and the time a little anterior to the Revolution, but which Taylor relates as a Venetian anecdote, to be found in the writings of

* Page 414.

Comitolus *. He uses it to illustrate the position that, "if an error be invincible, and the consequent of the persuasion be consistent with the state of grace, the error must rather be suffered than a grievous scandal, or an intolerable, or very great inconvenience." And he approves of the conduct of those learned and charitable casuists, who, in that case, determined to conceal from the young married couple the dreadful and complicated incest of which, by that union, they were innocently guilty.

It is not, however, from casuists or divines that he quotes alone. Historians, fathers, rabbies, poets, essayists, and jesters, are all ransacked for examples or illustrations; and he has given us one tale, not over decent, from, as he whimsically calls him, "My Lord Montaigne," as well as the celebrated story from the Facetiæ of Poggio, of the Italian robber, who, though his conscience was at rest as to the murders he had committed, was inconsolable for having accidentally broken his fast in Lent †.

On the whole, the Ductor Dubitantium is the work of a mind acute, vigorous, and imbued with an extent and variety of information which would have overburdened a meaner intellect, and by which Taylor himself is, perhaps, sometimes encumbered rather than adorned. A mind it is essentially poetical rather than critical, ardent in conception more than

* Vol xii. p. 30. † Vol. xii. 21.—xiii. 218.

lucid in arrangement. Yet his conceptions in themselves are almost always clear, though he overlays them not unfrequently with a profusion of words and metaphors; and though he is apt to derive his first principles from springs of action in themselves circumstantial and secondary. But, though it offers, in some respects, a less profound and original view of human motives than is to be met with in later writers; though its length renders it less readable, and the author's anxiety to say every thing on both sides of every question may leave a careless reader sometimes in suspense as to his final determination; it is still a work which few can read without profit, and none, I think, without entertainment. It resembles, in some degree, those ancient inlaid cabinets, (such as Evelyn, Boyle, or Wilkins might have bequeathed to their descendants,) whose multifarious contents perplex our choice, and offer to the admiration or curiosity of a more accurate age, a vast wilderness of trifles and varieties, with no arrangement at all, or an arrangement on obsolete principles; but whose ebony drawers and perfumed recesses contain specimens of every thing that is precious or uncommon, and many things for which a modern museum might be searched in vain.

On the two works which conclude the fourteenth volume of this collection, I know not that many observations are necessary. "The Divine Institution and Necessity of the Office Ministerial," enforces the

same doctrines, and by nearly the same arguments, as have been already considered in speaking of his "Episcopacy Asserted." The application, however, of those principles is, in this place, more general, and levelled rather at those fanatics, who, without any ordination, intrude on the ministerial office, than against those who reject the apostolic form of ecclesiastical government in favour of an aristocracy of presbyters. As such, it is, perhaps, better adapted to the evils of the present time than the work which I have formerly examined.

On the difficult question of lay-baptism, which naturally arises from his present subject, he expresses himself with a becoming doubt and moderation. The tendency of his mind is very plainly to the high-church doctrine, not only that the practice is illegal and presumptuous, but that the rite thus administered is invalid, and ought to be repeated. He admits, however, that the general practice of all Christian churches has been different, and he joins with Augustine in expressing his own hesitation. "Nescio an piè repetendum *."

Those who wish to see the difficulty discussed at greater length, or to learn what has been the practical decision of the Church of England on this interesting inquiry, will find much curious learning and much sound sense in Bingham's "Scholastic History of

* Pp. 444—452.

Lay Baptism," (published in the second volume of his Ecclesiastical Antiquities,) and in the excellent "Elucidation of the Common Prayer," by the late learned and amiable Mr. Shepherd*. In his essay on Confirmation, it is remarkable that Taylor himself has varied from his severer opinion, and assents, apparently, to the usual and ancient principle of "Fieri non debuit, factum valet†."

His "Rules and Advices to the Clergy," are, in a great degree, extracted from his two Sermons already noticed on "The Minister's Duty in Life and Doctrine‡." They are methodized, however, and, in some instances, enlarged and rendered more practical. They can hardly be read too often; or, with the necessary allowance for some difference of circumstances between Ireland and England, and between the seventeenth and the nineteenth century, — be too carefully or too closely followed.

The Golden Grove begins with a short and simple catechism for young persons, but neither so short, so simple, nor so complete, as that which our liturgy supplies. It has the merit, however, of furnishing a more detailed explanation of some important circumstances in our religion, than a more general and complete system of instruction could contain with the necessary regard to brevity; and may, therefore,

* Elucidation of the Common Prayer, vol. ii. p. 415.

† Vol. xiv. p. 268. ‡ Vol. vi. p. 483.

be with advantage used in schools and families, conjointly with that of good Dean Nowell.

The exposition of the creed, which follows, deserves no higher praise than that of enumerating, under the different heads of the old and compendious confession, the various items which make up the sum of each. Sometimes he mistakes, like Doddridge, amplification for explanation; and I do not know that a devout Christian gains much either of knowledge or edification, by having the single word "buried," decomposed into a statement which tells us how Christ, "that he might suffer every thing of human nature, was, by the care of his friends and disciples, by the leave of Pilate, taken from the cross and embalmed, (as the manner of the Jews was to bury,) and wrapt in linen, and buried in a new grave hewn out of a rock," &c. His commentaries, however, on the "Holy Ghost,"—"the Holy Catholic Church," and "the Communion of Saints," as they are more necessary and useful, so they are executed with his usual force and doctrinal precision. His "Agenda," too, (though, in some particulars, they are too ascetic, and calculated, it may be thought, to make men formalists rather than sincerely and actively holy;) are, generally speaking, excellent; and his "Postulanda" better still. The "Litanies for all things and persons," only rank inferior to that in our church service; and the other prayers, though some of them

too wordy, are such as can hardly be uttered or even read without exciting a spirit of devotion.

At the end of the Golden Grove are some hymns for different festivals, which, had they no other merit, would be interesting as the only remaining specimens of that which a mind so intrinsically poetical as Taylor's was, could effect when he attempted to arrange his conceptions in a metrical form. They are, however, in themselves, and on their own account, very interesting compositions. Their metre, indeed, which is that species of spurious Pindaric which was fashionable with his contemporaries, is an obstacle, and must always have been one, to their introduction into public or private psalmody; and the mixture of that alloy of conceits and quibbles, which was an equally frequent and still greater defilement of some of the finest poetry of the seventeenth century, will materially diminish their effect as devotional or descriptive odes. Yet, with all these faults, they are powerful, affecting, and often harmonious: there are many passages of which Cowley need not have been ashamed; and some which remind us, not disadvantageously, of the corresponding productions of Milton.

Such is the whole of the second hymn for Advent. Such too is the passage in his meditation on heaven, where he describes —

> "That bright eternity
> Where the great King's transparent throne
> Is of an entire jasper stone:

There the eye
O' the chrysolite,
And a sky
Of diamonds, rubies, chrysoprase,
And, above all, Thy holy face,
Make an eternal clarity.
When Thou thy jewels dost bind up, that day
Remember us, we pray,
That, where the beryl lies,
And the crystal, 'bove the skies,
There Thou mayst appoint us place,
Within the brightness of Thy face;
And our soul
In the scroll
Of life and blissfulness enroll,
That we may praise Thee to eternity!"

A more regular metre, and words more applicable to public devotion, may be found in the "Prayer for Charity."

"Full of mercy, full of love,
Look upon us from above!
Thou who taught'st the blind man's night
To entertain a double light,
Thine, and the day's, (and that thine too;)
The lame away his crutches threw;
The parched crust of leprosy
Returned unto its infancy;
The dumb amazed was to hear
His own unchain'd tongue strike his ear:
Thy powerful mercy did e'en chase
The devil from his usurped place,
Where thou thyself shouldst dwell, not he.
Oh, let thy love our pattern be,

Let thy mercy teach one brother
To forgive and love another;
That, copying thy mercy here,
Thy goodness may hereafter rear
Our souls unto thy glory, when
Our dust shall cease to be with men *."

His work on the Psalter has no resemblance to those of Hammond, Horsley, or even Horne. It merely consists of one or more prayers to each psalm, more or less appropriate to their respective subjects, and followed by a collection of devotions for various occasions. All these last are not original; all, however, are devout and practical, and, in the alternations of a regular and systematic piety, may be useful. His recommendation, in the preface, of the Psalter as a guide to, and foundation for, as well as an unfailing accompaniment of our daily prayers, is at once characteristic and sensible, and deserves the serious attention of those who have hitherto paid a less habitual deference to the most devotional and one of the most instructive parts of the sacred volume.

The "Collection of Offices," was intended as a substitute for the Common Prayer, when the use of this last was proscribed. As a substitute, it is, certainly, well adapted to its end; and, this being the case, it is no disparagement to say, that it falls

* Pp. 64 and 91.

extremely short of its original. There are, however, some beautiful prayers in the occasional offices, for widows, — the persecuted, — the prisoners, — the sick and the lunatic, which are admirably qualified to give comfort and relief to the broken heart, and may afford very valuable assistance to the clergy in the most popular and one of the most important of their ministries. The penitential litany, at the end of the work, is a striking summary of human crimes and follies *.

The last in date, and one of the best and most useful of his devotional works, is his "Worthy Communicant," which is, indeed, as its subject required, not only devotional but practical, and embraces in itself many of the same powerful and persuasive arguments against the self-flattery of the unrepenting sinner, and the needless terrors of the scrupulous conscience, which are detailed at greater length, and with a larger display of authorities, in the controversial and casuistical works which occupy the preceding volumes. This, indeed, with the Holy Living and Dying, may be said to offer a complete summary of the duties, and specimen of the devotions of a Christian; in which, while no necessary question of practice or piety is passed over, no doubtful or merely controversial question is admitted. In the lessons which flow from this chair, in the incense which flames on

* Pp. 328, 382, 343, 356, &c.

this altar, the sound of worldly polemics is hushed, the light of worldly fires becomes dim. We see a saint in his closet, a Christian bishop in his ministry; and we rise from the intercourse impressed and softened with a sense how much our own practice yet needs amendment, and how mighty has been that faith of which these are the fruits, that hope of which these are the pledges and prelibations.

Of the broader and more general lines of Taylor's literary character, a very few observations may be sufficient. The greatness of his attainments, and the powers of his mind, are evident in all his writings, and to the least attentive of his readers. It is hard to point out a branch of learning or of scientific pursuit to which he does not occasionally allude; or any author of eminence, either ancient or modern, with whom he does not evince himself acquainted. And it is certain, that as very few other writers have had equal riches to display, so he is apt to display his stores with a lavish exuberance, which the severer taste of Hooker or of Barrow would have condemned as ostentatious, or rejected as cumbersome. Yet he is far from a mere reporter of other men's arguments, — a textuary of fathers and schoolmen, — who resigns his reason into the hands of his predecessors, and who employs no other instrument for convincing their readers than a lengthened string of authorities. His familiarity with the stores of ancient and modern literature is employed to illustrate more frequently

than to establish his positions; and may be traced, not so much in direct citation, (though of this, too, there is, perhaps, more than sufficient,) as in the abundance of his allusions, the character of his imagery, and the frequent occurrence of terms of foreign derivation, or employed in a foreign and unusual meaning.

It is thus that he more than once refers to obscure stories in ancient writers, as if they were, of necessity, as familiar to all his readers as himself; that he talks of "poor Attilius Aviola," or "the Lybian lion," that "brake loose into his wilderness, and killed two Roman boys;" as if the accidents of which he is speaking had occurred in London a few weeks before. It is thus that, in warning an English (or a Welsh) auditory, against the brief term of mortal luxury, he enumerates a long list of ancient dainties, and talks of "the condited bellies of the scarus," and "drinking of healths by the numeral letters of Philenium's name." It is thus that one of his strangest and harshest similes, where he compares an ill-sorted marriage to "going to bed with a dragon," is the suggestion of a mind familiar with those *Lamiæ* with female faces and extremities like a serpent, of whose entanglements strange stories are told in the old dæmonologies. And thus that he speaks of the "*justice*" instead of the "juice" of fishes; of an "excellent" pain; of the gospel being preached, not to "the common people," but to "idiots;" and of "serpents,"

(meaning "creeping things,") devouring our bodies in the grave. It is this which gives to many of his most striking passages the air of translations; and which, in fact, may well lead us to believe that some of them are indeed the selected members of different and disjointed classics.

On the other hand, few circumstances can be named which so greatly contribute to the richness of his matter, the vivacity of his style, and the harmony of his language, as those copious drafts on all which is wise or beautiful or extraordinary, in ancient writers or in foreign tongues; and the very singularity and hazard of his phrases has not unfrequently a peculiar charm, which the observers of a tamer and more ordinary diction can never hope to inspire.

One of these archaisms, and a very graceful one, is the introduction of the comparative degree, simply and without its contrasted quantity; of which he has made a very frequent use, but which he has never employed without producing an effect of striking beauty.

Thus, he tells us of "a *more* healthy sorrow;" of "the air's *looser* garment, or the *wilder* fringes of the fire;" which, though in a style purely English they would be probably replaced by positive or superlative epithets, could hardly suffer this change without a considerable detraction from the spirit and raciness

of the sentence. The same observation may apply to the use of "*prevaricate*," in an active sense; to "the *temeration* of ruder handlings;" and to many similar expressions, which, if unusual, are at least expressive and sonorous, and which could hardly be replaced by the corresponding vernacular phrases without a loss of brevity or beauty. Of such expressions as these, it is only necessary to observe, that their use, to be effectual or allowable, should be more discreet perhaps, and infrequent, than is the case in the works of Taylor.

I have already noticed the familiarity which he himself displays, and which he apparently expected to find, in an almost equal degree, in his readers or hearers, with the facts of history, the opinions of philosophy, the productions of distant climates, and the customs of distant nations. Nor, in the allusions or examples which he extracts from such sources, is he always attentive to the weight of authority, or the probability of the fact alleged. The age, indeed, in which he lived, was, in many respects, a credulous one: The discoveries which had been made by the enterprise of travellers, and the unskilful, and as yet immature efforts of the new philosophy, had extended the knowledge of mankind just far enough to make them know that much yet remained uncertain, and that many things were true which their fathers had held for impossible. Such absence of

scepticism is, of all states of the human mind, most favourable to the increase of knowledge; but for the preservation of truths already acquired, and the needful separation of truth from falsehood, it is necessary to receive the testimony of men, however positive, with more of doubt than Boyle, Wilkins, or even Bacon, appear to have been accustomed to exercise.

But Taylor was any thing rather than a critical inquirer into facts (however strange) of history or philosophy. If such alleged facts suited his purpose, he received them without examination, and retailed them without scruple; and we therefore read, in his works, of such doubtful or incredible examples as that of a single city containing fifteen millions of inhabitants; of the Neapolitan manna, which failed as soon as it was subjected to a tax; and of the monument "nine furlongs high," which was erected by Ninus, the Assyrian.

Nor, in his illustrations, even where they refer to matters of daily observation, or of undoubted truth, is he always attentive to accuracy. "When men sell a mule," he tells us, "they speak of the horse that begat him, not of the ass that bore him." It is singular, that he should forget that, of mules, the ass is always the father. What follows is still more extraordinary; inasmuch as it shews a forgetfulness of the circumstances of two of the most illustrious

events in the Old Testament. "We should fight,' says he, "as Gideon did, with three hundred hardy brave fellows that would stand against all violence, rather than to make a noise with rams' horns and broken pitchers, like the men at the siege of Jericho" Had he thought twice, he must have recollected that "making a noise" was at least one principal part of the service required from Gideon's troops, and that the "broken pitchers" were their property alone, and a circumstance of which the narrative of the siege of Jericho affords not the least mention.

An occasional occurrence of such errors is indeed unavoidable; and, irrelevant as some of his illustrations are, and uncertain as may be the truth of others, there is none, perhaps, of his readers who would wish those illustrations fewer, to which his works owe so much of their force, their impressiveness, and their entertainment. As a reasoner, I do not think him matchless. He is, indeed, always acute, and, in practical questions, almost always sensible. His knowledge was so vast, that on every point of discussion he set out with great advantage, as being familiar with all the necessary preliminaries of the question, and with every ground or argument which had been elicited on either side by former controversies. But his own understanding was rather inventive than critical. He never failed to find a plausible argument for any opinion which he himself

entertained; he was as ready with plausible objections to every argument which might be advanced by his adversaries; and he was completely master of the whole detail of controversial attack and defence, and of every weapon of eloquence, irony, or sarcasm, which was most proper to persuade or to silence. But his own views were sometimes indistinct, and often hasty. His opinions, therefore, though always honest and ardent, he had sometimes occasion, in the course of his life, to change; and instances have been already pointed out, not only where his reasoning is inconclusive, but where positions, ardently maintained in some of his writings, are doubted or denied in others. But, it should be remembered how much he wrote during a life in itself not long, and, in its circumstances, by no means favourable to accurate research or calm reasoning. Nor can it be a subject of surprise, that a poor and oppressed man should be sometimes hurried too far in opposition to his persecutors, or that one who had so little leisure for the correction of his works should occasionally be found to contradict and repeat himself.

I have already had occasion to point out the versatility of his talents, which, though uniformly exerted on subjects appropriate to his profession, are distinguished, where such weapons are needed, by irony and caustic humour, as well as by those

milder and sublimer beauties of style and sentiment which are his more familiar and distinguishing characteristics. Yet to such weapons he has never recourse either wantonly or rashly. Nor do I recollect any instance in which he has employed them in the cause of private or personal, or even polemical hostility, or any occasion where their fullest severity was not justified and called for by crimes, by cruelty, by interested superstition, or base and sordid hypocrisy. His satire was always kept in check by the depth and fervour of his religious feelings, his charity, and his humility.

It is on devotional and moral subjects, however, that the peculiar character of his mind is most, and most successfully, developed. To this service he devotes his most glowing language; to this his aptest illustrations: his thoughts and his words at once burst into a flame, when touched by the coals of this altar; and whether he describes the duties, or dangers, or hopes of man, or the mercy, power, and justice of the Most High; whether he exhorts or instructs his brethren, or offers up his supplications in their behalf to the common Father of all,—his conceptions and his expressions belong to the loftiest and most sacred description of poetry; of which they only want, what they cannot be said to need, the name and the metrical arrangement.

It is this distinctive excellence, still more than

the other qualifications of learning and logical acuteness, which has placed him, even in that age of gigantic talent, on an eminence superior to any of his immediate contemporaries; which has exempted him from the comparative neglect into which the dry and repulsive learning of Andrews and Sanderson has fallen;—which has left behind the acuteness of Hales, and the imaginative and copious eloquence of Bishop Hall, at a distance hardly less than the cold elegance of Clark, and the dull good sense of Tillotson; and has seated him, by the almost unanimous estimate of posterity, on the same lofty elevation with Hooker and with Barrow.

Of such a triumvirate, who shall settle the precedence? Yet it may, perhaps, be not far from the truth, to observe that Hooker claims the foremost rank in sustained and classic dignity of style, in political and pragmatical wisdom; that to Barrow the praise must be assigned of the closest and clearest views, and of a taste the most controlled and chastened; but that in imagination, in interest, in that which more properly and exclusively deserves the name of genius, Taylor is to be placed before either. The first awes most, the second convinces most, the third persuades and delights most: and, (according to the decision of one whose own rank among the ornaments of English literature yet

remains to be determined by posterity,) Hooker is the object of our reverence, Barrow of our admiration, and Jeremy Taylor of our love*.

* Ὠκηρων μὲν σεβω, θαυμαζω δε Βαῤῥουν, και φιλ. Ταϊλωρον. — *Note to Parr's Spital Sermon.*—This characteristic and powerful sentence has been already noticed by Archdeacon Bonney.

# NOTES.

## NOTE (A.)

Mr. Bonney supposes him to have been their *second* son; but I am indebted to the kindness of my friend and connexion, Mr. Julius Hare, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, for the following list, extracted from the parish register, which makes it apparent that he had two elder brothers, and one elder sister. There are other persons of the same name mentioned in the register, but none whom we have any reason to suppose connected with the Bishop's family. Nor is it quite certain that the surname of Nathaniel Taylor's wife is correctly spelled, the writing in the register being very indistinct. As their first son was named Edmond, it is probable that the Edmond Taylor entered as churchwarden, was Nathaniel's father or near relation.

"1589. Edmond Taylor, churchwarden.

1605. Nathaniel Taylor and Mary Dean, married the 13th of October.

1606. Edmond Taylor, churchwarden.

—— Edmond, son of Nathaniel and Mary Taylor, bapt. August 3.

1607. Edmond Taylor, buried 22d September.

1609. Mary Taylor, daughter of Nathaniel and Mary, bapt. 11th June.

1611. Nathaniel Taylor, son of Nathaniel and Mary, bapt. 8 December.

1613. Jeremy Taylor, son of Nathaniel and Mary, bapt. 15 August.

1616. Thomas Taylor, son of Nathaniel and Mary, bapt. 21 July.

1619. John Taylor, son of Nathaniel and Mary, bapt. 13 April.

1621. Churchwardens, Tobias Smith and Nathaniel Taylor."

There are two old houses in Cambridge, which tradition points out as claimants for the honour of having been the place of Taylor's birth. The preference seems to rest with that which is now the Bull Inn, opposite Trinity Church. The rival tenement, known by the sign of the Wrestlers, in the Petty Cury, is, as I am assured, beyond the limits of the parish where Jeremy Taylor and his brothers were baptized, where his parents were married, and where his father, as above stated, served the office of churchwarden.

## NOTE (B.)

The arms are "Ermine, on a chief indented sable, three escallops, or; the crest a lion rampant, issuant, ermine, having between his paws a ducal coronet, or." I find in Gwyllim's Heraldry, p. 244, (a book so full of odd information and entertainment of a peculiar kind, as almost to justify the predilection of Sir Hildebrand Osbaldiston,) that "this coat was confirmed to Roger Taylor, son of Thomas Taylor, son of Roger Taylor, of London, Esquire, by Sir William Segar, Garter, December 4, 1674, in the 12th year of King James the First." But my inquiries at the heralds' office have not succeeded in tracing any connexion between this family, and that either of the Bishop, or Doctor Rowland Taylor.

## NOTE (C.)

The account of Rowland Taylor's character and sufferings may be found in the Book of Martyrs, p. 155, ed. 1752, and in Wordsworth's Ecclesiastical Biography, vol. ii. p. 483. The spot where he suffered on Aldham Common was distinguished, in after times, by a rude stone with a ruder inscription:—

> "Doctor Taylor, for defending what was good,
> In this place shed his blood."

This was enclosed with iron rails by David Wilkins, D.D., Rector of Hadleigh in 1721—(See NICHOLL's *Illustrations of Literary History*, vol. iii. p. 436). In

1819, a neat obelisk was erected above it by subscription, with the following spirited lines from the pen of the Rev. Dr. Hay Drummond :—

" This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith."

" Mark this rude stone, where Taylor dauntless stood,
Where zeal infuriate drank the martyr's blood!
Hadleigh! that day how many a tearful eye
Saw thy loved Pastor dragg'd a victim by!
Still scattering gifts and blessings as he past,
To the blind pair his farewell alms were cast.
His clinging flock ev'n here around him pray'd,
' As thou hast aided us, be God thine aid!'
Nor taunts, nor bribe of mitred rank, nor stake,
Nor blows, nor flames, his heart of firmness shake;
Serene, his folded hands, his upward eyes,
Like holy Stephen's, seek the opening skies :—
There, fix'd in rapture, his prophetic sight
Views truth dawn clear on England's bigot night.
Triumphant Saint! he bow'd to kiss the rod;
Then soar'd on seraph wing to meet his God!"

## NOTE (D.)

In the note of Jeremy Taylor's admission at Caius College, (see Bonney, p. 3, 4, note,) his tutor, Bachcroft, represents him as fifteen years of age, and as having been, for ten years, under the tuition of Mr. Lovering. But, in 1626, the year of his entrance, he cannot have been more than thirteen, and he is represented as no more by his friend and encomiast Bishop Rust. It is probable, therefore, that his

parents, in order to facilitate his becoming a member of the university, represented him as older than he really was, and as having attended school longer than he could have done with any advantage. Hence, however, a degree of uncertainty has attached itself to his age; and Sir James Ware, in the Catalogue of Irish Bishops, has supposed him, at the time of his death, to have been two years older than he really can have been.

NOTE (E.)

In the "Pietas Puerilis" of Erasmus, the young scholar is made to say, "Adornatâ parentibus mensâ, recito consecrationem, deinde, prandentibus ministro, donec jubeor et ipse prandium sumere."

NOTE (F.)

The Archbishop's letter of recommendation is as follows. It has been already published by my friend Mr. Bliss, in his excellent edition of the Athenæ Oxonienses, art. Taylor, p. 782, vol. iii., from Tanner's MSS. in the Bodleian. A copy also, corresponding exactly with this, is in the archives of All Souls.

"*To the Warden and Fellows of All-Souls Coll., Oxford. Salutem in Christo.*

"These are on the behalf of an honest man and a good scholar: Mr. Osborn, being to give over his fellowship, was with me at Lambeth, and, I thank

him, freely proffered me the nomination of a scholar to succeed in his place. Now, having seriously deliberated with myself touching this business, and being willing to recommend such a one to you as you might thank me for, I am resolved to pitch upon Mr. Jeremiah Taylour, of whose abilitys and sufficiencys every ways I have received very good assurance. And I do hereby heartily pray you to give him all furtherance by yourself and the fellows at the next election, not doubting but that he will approve himself a worthy and learned member of your society. And, though he has had his breeding, for the most part, in the other university, yet I hope that shall be no prejudice to him, in regard that he is incorporated into Oxford, (ut sit eodem ordine, gradu, &c.,) and admitted into University College. Neither can I learn that there is any thing in your local statutes against it. I doubt not but you will use him with so fair respects, as befits a man of his rank and learning, for which I shall not fail to give you thanks. So I leave him to your kindness, and rest

"Your loving friend,

"WILLIAM CANT.

"Lambeth House, October 23, 1635."

My authority for the account I have given of the proceedings of the College, in consequence of this letter, is a certificate signed "William Page," contained in a note to a MS. copy of the statutes of

All-Souls, with many marginal observations, which formerly belonged to Warden Gardiner, and is now kept in the wardens' lodgings as an heir-loom. Page gives the account nearly as I have stated it, and vouches from his own knowledge, (he having been a fellow of the college at the time,) that the fellows were "*almost unanimous in their election of Taylor.*"

The William Page, whose narrative this is, was a person of some reputation among his contemporaries. He became a fellow of All-Souls 1619, and was afterwards, through the patronage of Laud, rector of Reading school, and of East Locking, near Wantage. He wrote, among other things, a Treatise on Bowing at the Name of Jesus, which Archbishop Abbot commanded him to suppress; but which Laud, on succeeding to the primacy, encouraged him to publish.—Wood, *Athenæ*, vol. ii. p. 332. ed. p. 1721.

The nomination of Taylor to the fellowship, on its devolving, as I have stated, to the visitor, has been also published both by Mr. Bliss and Mr. Bonney:—

"Nominatio Jer. Taylor ad locum Socii in Coll. Omn. Anim. Oxon.

"Gulielmus Providentiâ Divinâ Cant. Archiep'us, totius Angliæ Primas et Metropol. necnon Universitatis Oxon. Cancellar. Collegiique Animarum Omnium fidelium defunctorum de Oxon. Visitator, Patronus et Ordinarius. Dilectis nobis in Christo, Custodi, Vice-custodi, omnibusque et singulis dicti

Collegii Sociis et scholaribus, salutem et gratiam. Cùm locus Socii Artista Collegii vestri dudum vacaverit, et vacuus est in præsenti, cùmque potestas supplendi deficientem numerum Sociorum vestrorum nobis per statuta vestri Collegii sit reservata, ratione negligentiæ vestræ, eo quod dictus locus Socii vacantis, infra dies in statutis Collegii vestri limitatos, per vos non fuerit perimpletus. Nos numerum Sociorum vestrorum, secundum potestatem à Fundatore vestro nobis commissam implere volentes, Jeremiam Taylor ad dictum locum vacantem designamus vobis, mandantes ut præfatum Jeremiam Taylor ad dictum locum vacantem secundum formam statutorum Collegii vestri recipiatis et admittatis. In cujus rei testimonium, sigillum nostrum Archiep'ale præsentibus apponi fecimus. Dat.' in manerio nostro de Lambehith, vicesimo primo die mensis Novembris, anno D'ni 1635, et nostræ trans. anno tertio."

In consequence of this mandate, Taylor was admitted, as appears by the college book, where he is described as "Jeremias Taylor, Dioc. Elie. Artium Mag. 1636. Jan. 14." It is remarkable, that both he and two others, who are admitted at the same time, are described as admitted "in veros et perpetuos Socios." But, to become an actual fellow, in the first instance, without a previous year of probation, is a privilege peculiar to founder's kin. How Taylor came by it I am ignorant. If I could trace his descent to any of the families connected with the stock

of Chichele, it would sufficiently confirm my hypothesis of his gentility. But on this point I am without information.

NOTE (r.)

"Then followed the charge of Sancta Clara's book, alias Monsieur St. Giles: so they expressed it, and I must follow the way they lead me. First then, they charge that *I had often conference with him, while he was writing his book entitled* 'Deus, Natura, Gratia.' No; he never came to me till he was ready to print that book. Then some friends of his brought him to me. His suit then was, that he might print that book here. Upon speech with him, I found the scope of his book to be such, as that the Church of England would have little cause to thank him for it: and so absolutely denied it. Nor did he ever come more at me after this, but twice or thrice at most, when he made great friends to me, that he might print another book to prove that bishops are by divine right. My answer then was, that I did not like the way which the Church of Rome went in the case of episcopacy. And, howsoever, that I would never give way that any such book should be printed here from the pen of a Romanist, and that the bishops of England were able to defend their own cause and calling, without calling in aid from Rome; and would in due time. Maintenance he never had any from me, nor did I then know him to be a priest. Nor

was there any proof so much as offered in contrary to any of this." — LAUD's *Troubles and Trial*, p. 385.

For the manner of Davenport's introduction to Laud by Lindsell, see Canterbury's Doom, p. 427; quoted in the Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. iii. col. 1223.

NOTE (H.)

"Quotidianis eorum quos Regiæ commendarent literæ ad gradum quemcunque promotionibus lassata demum Universitas, frequentem vicesimo primo Feb. Senatum coegit, in quo Vicecancellarii et Præfectorum libellus supplex, Regi contra gradus temerè et quasi fortuitò conferendos porrigendus, recitatur. Hi vero damna nobis necessario facienda Carolo ob oculos ponebant, Actibus utique et Exercitiis quibusque Scholasticis in desuetudinem abeuntibus, vel etiam omninò deletis, ærarium academicum exinanitum fore, restinctis quòque magnorum ingeniorum studiis summa Universitatem infamia laboraturam edocentes. Accepto autem supplici illo Togatorum libello, tunc quidem ostendit Rex quàm verè et animitùs bonarum literarum curam ageret. Quamvis enim et opibus et authoritate haud adeo abundanti percommodum videretur fidem suorum et officia honoribus togatis remunerare, statuit tamen et edixit nequis Gradum Academicum in questum ambiens literas suas commendatrices deinceps expectaret;

quod, si cuiquam concederentur, ad locum inter Academicos quem expeteret habilem sese et idoneum secundum Statuta probaret, cautionem de præstandis exercitiis interponeret, et feuda consueta persolveret; aliter nullam literarum suarum habendam esse rationem."—Wood, *Hist. et Ant. Ox.* ann. 1642. l. i. p. 359.

NOTE (I.)

"I had no books," says Taylor, "of my own here, nor any in the voisinage; and *but that I remembered the result of some of those excellent discourses I had heard your Lordship make, when I was so happy as, in private, to gather up what your temperance and modesty forbids to be public*, I had come 'in prœlia inermis,' and, like enough, might have fared accordingly."—*Epistle Dedicatory to the Liberty of Prophesying*, vol. vii. p. cccxcvii. For the encouragement and assistance afforded by Hatton to Dugdale, see Wood, Athen. ii. Fasti, p. 92; and Dugdale's Dedication to the Antiquities of Warwickshire. Hatton's loyalty and attachment to the Church of England have never been impeached.—Of the first, the Letter from King Charles, published by Mr. Bonney, is an evidence: as is also the sequestration of his estate by the Parliament in 1649.—Whitelock, p. 125. The latter was shewn by the pains which he took in frustrating the attempt of Queen Henrietta Maria to bring over the Duke of Gloucester

to popery.—See Clarendon, Hist. Reb. iii. 426; and Carte, Life of Ormond, ii. pp. 164, 167-8. It is something remarkable, that none of Taylor's biographers have noticed a passage in his Dedication of the Great Exemplar, in which he appears to claim kindred with Hatton. He there "entreats his lordship to account him in the number of his *relatives*." This is a very unusual expression, if he meant by it no more than "friends" or "dependants;" and the word "relative," is elsewhere employed by Taylor in its usual and modern acceptation. The family of Taylor himself is involved in so much obscurity, that it is hopeless to inquire whether or at what period his ancestors had become connected with those of his patron. But the connexion (though it would, in this case, hardly amount to relationship,) may have been through one of his wives; though on this point also I am without information.

NOTE (J.).

The first edition of this work is in 12mo, entitled, "The Psalter of David, with Titles and Collects according to the matter of each Psalm. By the Right Honourable Christopher Hatton, Oxon. 1644." The same work occurs in Royston's Catalogue at the end of "The Great Exemplar, Lond. 1653." And the "Fifth edition, with additionals," is mentioned in the catalogue of the same bookseller, appended to the Συμβολον Ηθικο-πολεμικον. Lond. 1657.

In both cases it is said to be by the Right Honourable Christopher Hatton; and accordingly it is regarded as his work both by Wood and Collins. The preface, however, and many of the prayers, bear evident marks of Taylor's characteristic and inimitable workmanship. And at length, in the eighth edition enlarged, published by Royston in 1672, the name of Hatton is omitted, and that of "Jer. Taylor, D.D. Chaplain to King Charles Ist. of blessed Memory," is inserted in its place.—To these facts, nothing can be opposed but the assertion in the preface, that its author did not "wait at the altar." But, if the work were designed to pass for Hatton's, such an expression is no more than we should expect to find; and the authenticity of the volume is now, indeed, very generally acknowledged.

For most of the facts contained in the above note, I have again to acknowledge my obligations to Mr. Bonney's manuscript information.

## NOTE (K.)

William Nicholson was the son of Christopher Nicholson, a rich clothier of Stratford, near Hadleigh, Suffolk. He was brought up as a chorister at Magdalen College, Oxford, where he was afterwards bible clerk, and, eventually, became tutor to the Lord Percy, and chaplain to his father the Earl of Northumberland. In 1616, he was elected master of the free-school at Croydon, where his discipline

and powers of instruction were much celebrated. He resigned this situation in 1629, when he obtained the rectory of Llandilo Vawr, in Caermarthenshire; to which were afterwards added the dignities of residentiary of St. David's and archdeacon of Brecknock. In 1643, he was named as one of the assembly of divines at Westminster, probably by the interest of the Earl of Northumberland; but he never took his place among them, and his livings being shortly after sequestered, he again taught school for his maintenance, in which way of life he continued till the Restoration.

In 1660-1, he was appointed bishop of Gloucester, by the interest of Lord Clarendon, whom Wood insinuates that he had bribed. But as his character appears to have stood high with all parties, and as he had a strong and legitimate claim on the patronage of government, for his unshaken loyalty, and bold and pertinacious defence of the church during its most helpless and hopeless depression, it seems most reasonable, as well as most charitable, to ascribe his preferment rather to his merits than to simony. He died Feb. 5, 1671, and was honoured with the following epitaph by the excellent George Bull, afterwards Bishop of St. David's.

"Æternitati S. In spe beatæ resurrectionis, hîc reverendas exuvias deposuit Theologus insignis, Episcopus verè primitivus, Gul. Nicholson, in agro Suffolciano natus, apud Magdalenses educatus, ob fidem Regi et Ecclesiæ afflictæ præstitam, ad sedem

Glocestrensem meritò promotus, anno 1660. In concionibus frequens, in scriptis nervosus, legenda scribens, et faciens scribenda. Gravitas Episcopalis in fronte emicuit, pauperibus quotidiana charitate beneficus, comitate erga clerum et liberatos admirandus, gloriæ ac dierum satur, in palatio suo, ut vixit, piè decessit, Feb. 5, Anno ætatis LXXII. Dom. MDCLXXI. Elizabetha conjux præivit, in hoc sacello sepulta, Apr. XX. An. Dom. MDCLXIII. Owenus Brigstock de Lechdenny in comitatu Caermarthen, Armiger, prædictæ Elizabethæ nepos, hoc grati animi monumentum, (executore recusante,) propriis sumptibus erexit. An. MDCLXXIX."

Bishop Nicholson's published works, of which a catalogue is given by Wood, are all of a practical and useful character. That he was joined, for a time at least, with Taylor in his school at Newton, appears from the following epitaph which Mr. Bonney has published, and to which I have already alluded in the text:

MS.

"Griffini Lloyd, de Cwmgwilly, Armigeri, qui, honestis parentibus Llanarthneiæ natus, literarum tyrocinia posuit sub summis viris Gul. Nicholsono, Ep. posteà Glocestrensi, et Jer. Tayloro Ep. Dunensi, qui, grassante Cromwellii tyrannide, in hac vicinia victum queritabant."—BONNEY, p. 175.

William Wyat, Taylor's other associate in this undertaking, was born at Todenham, in Gloucestershire; and, after some delay in obtaining his degrees at Oxford, through the calamities attendant on the civil war, became B. D. Sept. 12, 1661. On

leaving Newton Hall, he taught at Evesham, in Worcestershire; and, afterwards, was assistant in a private school at Twickenham, kept by William Fuller, afterwards Bishop of Lincoln. Under his patronage he was installed prebendary of Lidington, May 13, 1668, and precentor of Lincoln Cathedral, November 6th, of the same year. The latter dignity he resigned in 1681, but retained the prebend till his death, which took place in the house of Sir Richard Newdigate, at Nuneaton, in Warwickshire. He was buried at Astley, in the same county, where, over the communion-table, is a small marble tablet, with the following quaint inscription:

P. M.

"Gulielmi Wyat, S. T. B. quem ab ecclesia Lincoln. (ubi Præcentor erat meritissimus,) huc traxit quietis studium et honoratæ juxta de Arburia familiæ vicinitas et patrocinium, quibus frui cætera omnia lubens desereret. Obiit 9 Septembris, 1685, in magna sua climacteria, et quia, uti vixerat, sic moreretur, omnibus numeris absolutus.

BONNEY, *MS.* p. 44. BROWNE WILLIS, *Hist. of Cathedrals*, vol. ii. pp. 89. 211.

Φιλοτιμεισθαι ησυχαζειν."

For Sir John Powell's epitaph I am indebted to his descendant, the Reverend Mr. Evans, of Newtown Hall, in the county of Montgomery.

M. S.

JOHANNIS POWELL, Equitis Aurati,
Qualis fuerit, non ab exiguo Monumenti marmore,
Sed ab annalibus Regni Historicorum Libris

Quæras edoceri. — Bonas Artes, quibus sub optimo Præceptore,
(Jeremiâ Taylor) posteà Episcopo Dunensi,
A primâ Juventute enutritus erat,
In academiâ dehinc Oxoniensi, feliciter excoluit.
Indè (quanquam Literis humanioribus dedito
Ruri eleganter delitescere,
Quæ erat ejus modestia, magis allubescerat)
Patriæ tamen sese deberi ratus,
Nodosis Legem Vinculis implicari
Et in Ferro splendescere
maluit.
Et dummodo prodesset
Conspici non gravatus est.
Honores itaque nunquam solicitus petiit,
Ultro ad se delatos sæpissimè detrectavit.
Utrumque Tribunal,
Banci Regis et Communium Placitorum
Judex, adornavit.
Magni Sigilli Custodiam
Non dubitavit recusare,
Omni scilicet Titulo superior.
Quam strenuus Ecclesiæ Defensor fuerit,
Testis si septem Apostolici Præsules
Quos ob Christi Fidem fortiter vindicatam
Ad ipsius Tribunal accitos
Intrepidus absolvit.
Hinc à Justiciaria Cathedrâ honorificè dejectus
Non multo post, mutatis Regni Rebus,
Eandem iterum implevit.
Tandem Laboribus quos tulit plurimos,
Dum Patriæ consuleret,
Afflicto cuique et oppresso subveniret,
Teneretque Legum et Monarchiæ Dignitatem.
Fractus decessit,
Anno D. 1696, æt. 63.

Sir John Powell's dignified conduct on the trial of the seven Bishops is well known. Its merit is enhanced, if the tradition of his family, and of this Epitaph, be correct, that he was offered the great seal, if he would pursue a different course.

## NOTE (L.)

### "ON THE NEW FORCERS OF CONSCIENCE UNDER THE LONG PARLIAMENT.

"Because ye have thrown off your prelate Lord,
And with stiff vows renounc'd his liturgy,
To seize the widow'd whore Plurality
From them whose sin ye envied, not abhorr'd,
Dare ye for this adjure the civil sword,
To force our consciences whom Christ set free,
And ride us with a Classic hierarchy,
Taught you by mere A. S. and *Rutherford*?
Men whose life, learning, faith, and pure intent,
Would have been held in high esteem by Paul,
Must now be nam'd and branded heretics
By shallow Edwards and Scotch What-d'ye-call.
But we do hope to find out all your tricks,
Your plots and packings, worse than those of Trent;
That so the Parliament
May, with their wholesome and preventive shears,
Clip your phylacteries, though baulk your ears,
And succour our just fears,
When they shall read this plainly in your charge,
New Presbyter is but old Priest writ large."

I can hardly think that Goodwin and Peters, the principal individuals who shared with Taylor the indignation of Rutherford and the Presbyterians, were

men whom Milton, so ordinarily sparing of his praise, could have extolled as those whom St. Paul would have "held in high esteem." But Taylor was, beyond all comparison, the most illustrious champion of those tolerating doctrines for which Milton himself so nobly contended, and I cannot help supposing that his name was in the poet's mind, when he was thus assailing their common adversaries.

Rutherford's work is perhaps the most elaborate defence of persecution which has ever appeared in a Protestant country. He justifies it from the *law of nature*, the Mosaic law, the *analogy of the Christian religion*, the practice of the patriarchs and godly princes of old time; the prophecies which foretel that the kings which have sometimes served the Babylonian harlot shall, on their repentance, burn her with fire, and eat her flesh; and the commandment of St. John, that a true believer is not to say God speed to a false teacher. They who condemn the burning of Servetus would have condemned, he tells us, on the same principles, the slaughter of the priests of Baal; and, though he seems, in one place, to have some compunctious doubts as to the propriety of fire as an instrument of conversion, and, on the whole, to give the preference to hanging, yet, he elsewhere urges that, as stoning was the punishment of idolatry under the Mosaic law, and as the despisers of the Gospel are, unquestionably, worthy of a much sorer punishment, — so it may be thought that burning hath something in it marvellously suited to the occa-

sion and to the necessities of Christendom. To invade a foreign nation of idolaters with a view to apply such instruments and means of grace, he, indeed, confesses to be of doubtful morality; but it may be, he says, a most interesting and curious question, whether, such a conquest having been effected on other grounds, it is not the duty of the believing conqueror to force away the children of his new subjects, to the end that they may be brought up in the true religion? Such were the sentiments, and so far as they had the power, the practice of Rutherford himself; of Mather, who published, about the same time, a pamphlet entitled "The Tenet of Persecution washed white in the Blood of the Lamb;" and of many others, who, when their own hour of trial and suffering came, were ready enough to accuse their adversaries of unchristian and inhuman severity. The arguments of Rutherford are not likely in the present day to make many converts to his opinion. But, if there are any who, from the confidence with which he urges the example of the ancient Jewish kings and prophets, are led to form opinions unfavourable to a religion with which our own is so closely connected, they may do well to read the Commentaries of Michaelis on the Laws of Moses, book v. chap. 2.; in which the nature of the practices forbidden by the Jewish legislator, and the manner in which his prohibitions differ from persecution in its true and odious sense, are clearly and powerfully stated. I will only add, that where murder or lust are parts of any

religious system, the actions, being in themselves offences against the peace of society, are clearly punishable, without examining further into the mistaken notions from which they spring: and such was the case with the superstitions of Canaan.

NOTE (M.)

The pictures of these two ladies are still at Golden Grove, and in good preservation. That of the first displays a countenance marked with all the goodness and benignity which might be expected from the character which Taylor gives her; the second has a much more lofty and dignified air, such as might become the heroine in Comus. The first lady Carbery left three sons and six daughters. Her eldest son, Francis Lord Vaughan, married Rachel, daughter of Thomas Wriothesley, earl of Southampton, who survived her husband, and afterwards became conspicuous in English history as the heroic wife and widow of William lord Russell. A copy of Taylor's Essay on Repentance, presented to her by the author, is now in the possession of the Rev. Dr. Swire, of Melsonby, near Richmond, Yorkshire.

From Mr. Bonney's MS. Notes, and information supplied by Archdeacon Benyon.

NOTE (M*.)

"The calamities which lately arrived you, came to me so late, and with so much incertitude during my

long absence from these parts, that till my returne, and earnest inquisition, I could not be cured of my very greate impatience to be satisfied concerning your condition. But so it pleased God, that when I had prepared to receive that sad newes, and deplore your restraint, I was assured of your release, and delivered of much sorrow. It were imprudent, and a character of much ignorance, to inquire into the cause of any good man's suffering in these sad tymes; yet, if I have learned it out, 'twas not of my curiosity; but the discourse of some with whom I have had some habitudes since my coming hi me. *I had read the preface long since to your 'Golden Grove,' remember and infinitely justifie all that you have there asserted. 'Tis true vallor to dare to be undon, and the consequent of truth hath ever been in danger of his teeth, and it is a blessing if men escape so in these dayes, when not the safties onely, but the soules of men are betrayed; whilst such as you, and such excellent assistances as they afford us, are rendered criminal and suffer.* But you, Sir, who have furnished the world with so rare precepts against the efforts of all secular disasters whatsoever, could never be destitute of those consolations which you have so charitably and so piously prescribed unto others: yea, rather, this has turned to our im'ense advantage, nor lesse to your glory, whilst men behold you living your owne institutions, and preaching to us as effectualy in your chaines as in the chaire, in the prison as in the pulpit: for me

thinkes, Sir, I heare you pronounce it, as indeede you act it —

" Aude aliquid brevibus gyaris et carcere dignum
" Si vis esse aliquis ——

" that your example might shame such as betray any truth for feare of men, whose mission and com'ission is from God. You, Sir, know in the generall, and I must justifie in particular, with infinite cognition, the benefit I have received from the truths you have delivered. I have perused that excellent 'Unum Necessarium' of yours to my very greate satisfaction and direction: and do not doubt but it shall, in tyme, gaine upon all those exceptions, which I know you are not ignorant, appeare against it. 'Tis a great deale of courage, and a great deale of perill, but to attempt the assault of an error so inveterate.

" Αι δὲ κεναὶ [κεναὶ] κρίσεις τὸν ἀπέρατον ὀδὸν. False opinion knows no bottome, and reason and prescription meet in so [Quære NO?] fewe instances; but certainly you greately vindicate the divine goodnesse, which the ignorance of men and popular mistakes have so long charged with injustice. But, Sir, you must expect with patience the event, and the fruites you contend for: as it shall be my dayly devotions for your successe, who remaine,

" Rev^d. Sir, &c.

" Say's Court, 9 Feb. 1654. " JOHN EVELYN."

EVELYN's *Memoirs*, vol. ii. p. 97.

On this letter the editor of the interesting work whence it is extracted observes, "The cause of his [Jeremy Taylor's] imprisonment does not appear." Surely the passage here marked in italics intimates it with sufficient clearness. In the preface to his "Golden Grove," there are, in fact, many passages at which the government were likely to take umbrage. "The people," says the author, "are fallen under the harrows and saws of impertinent and ignorant preachers, who think all religion is a sermon, and all sermons ought to be libels against truth and old governors; and expound chapters that the meaning may never be understood, and pray that they may be thought able to talk, but not to hold their peace, they casting not to obtain any thing but wealth and victory, power, and plunder." —— "They that hate bishops have destroyed monarchy, and they that would erect an ecclesiastical monarchy must consequently subject the temporal to it; and both one and the other would be supreme in consciences; and they that govern there with an opinion that in all things they ought to be attended to, will let their prince govern others, so long as he will be ruled by them."

"*If any man shall not decline to try his title by the word of God,* it is certain there is not in the world a better guard for it than the true protestant religion, as it is taught in our church. But let all things be as it pleases God, &c. &c."

I am aware that in all these expressions Taylor might plead that he meant no more than to recommend his sect to the toleration or protection of the ruling powers. But even a less jealous party than the Presbyterians, and a less arbitrary governor than Cromwell, might in such times, find it necessary to notice them.

The above letter, it will be observed, is dated in 1654. It is certain, however, either that Evelyn has written 4 for 5 by mistake, or that he has, in this instance, followed a practice (at that time not uncommon in England, but of which his other letters give us no example,) of reckoning the beginning of each year from Lady Day, so that the months of January, February, and March, down to the 25th, were ascribed to the preceding year. This space was generally dated 165⅓, &c.; but sometimes also with the date of the preceding year only. And it is certain that the letter in question cannot have been written before 1655, from his assertion that he had "long since read the preface to the 'Golden Grove,' and had now seen the 'Unum Necessarium.'" But, on consulting the books of Stationers' Hall, I find that of these works the 'Golden Grove' was only entered there on January 26, 165⅓, and the 'Unum Necessarium' not till the 3d of May following. It is true, indeed, and we must bear it in mind in order to account for the fact of his having seen these works

at all, that the entrance of a work at Stationers' Hall, is not necessarily or usually immediate on its first publication. But many months are seldom allowed to elapse before this precaution is taken; and we may, therefore, fix the appearance of the 'Golden Grove' at the beginning of January, and the 'Unum Necessarium' somewhat later in the same month. For the former, indeed, it would be desirable if an earlier date could be fixed, both in order to render Evelyn's long acquaintance with it a less improper mode of speaking, and to give time for Taylor's consequent imprisonment. And I am, therefore, inclined to apprehend that, although the first edition of the 'Golden Grove' is dated in 1655, it was nevertheless published in Michaelmas term 1654. I am informed by a learned friend, whose familiarity with the curiosities of English literature has been rarely surpassed or equalled, that "the custom of *antedating* new books is still practised pretty extensively, and it was equally common in Taylor's day. Among Anthony a-Wood's books are (I should think) more than a hundred, on which the honest antiquary hath written, 'This booke came out (on such a day), though it be dated (at such a time.') And it is not impossible that the 'Golden Grove' might have been in a similar predicament. If this be allowed, and we conclude, as I think we well may, that Evelyn's letter was not written till 1655, there will remain a period of

between four and six months, which would be quite sufficient to allow Evelyn's long familiarity with the preface."

NOTE (N.)

"April 15, 1654. I went to London to hear the famous Dr. Jeremy Taylor, (since bishop of Down and Connor,) at St. Greg. on 6 Matt. 48. concerning evangelical perfection."

"March 18, 1655. Went to London on purpose to heare that excellent preacher, Dr. Jeremy Taylor, on 14 Matt. 17; shewing what were the conditions of obtaining eternal life; also concerning abatements for unavoidable infirmities, how cast on the accompt of the crosse. On the 31st I made a visit to Dr. Jer. Taylor, to confer with him about some spirituall matters, using him thenceforward as my ghostly father. I beseech God Almighty to make me ever mindful of and thankful for his heavenly assistances." —EVELYN'S *Memoirs*, vol. i. pp. 273—293.

NOTE (O)

"REV^d. SIR,

"It was another extraordinary charity which you did me when you lately relieved my apprehensions of your danger by that which I just now received: and, though the general persecution reinforce; yet it is your particular which most concernes me in this sad catalysis and declension of piety to which we are now reduced. But, Sir, what is now to be don that

the starrs of our bright hemisphere are every where pulling from their orbs? I remember where you have sayd it was the harbinger of the greate day; and a very sober and learned person, my worthy friend, the greate Oughtred, did the other day, seriously persuade me 'parare in cursum,' and will needs have the following yeares productive of wonderfull and universal changes. What to say of that I know not: but certaine it is we are brought to a sad condition. I speake concerning secular yet religious persons; whose glory it will only be to lie buried in your ruines, a monument too illustrious for such as I am. For my part, I have learned from your excellent assistances to humble myselfe, and to adore the inscrutable pathes of the Most High: God and his truth are still the same, though the foundations of the world be shaken. Julianus Redivivus can shut the schooles indeede, and the temples; but he cannot hinder our private intercourses and devotions, where the breast is the chappell and our heart is the altar. Obedience founded in the understanding will be the onely cure and retraite. God will accept what remaines, and supply what is necessary. He is not obliged to externals, the purest ages passed under the cruelest persecutions: it is sometimes necessary; and this, and the fulfilling of prophecy, are all instruments of greate advantage (even whilst they presse, and are incumbent) to those who can make a sanctified use of them. But as the thoughts of many

hearts will be discovered, and multitudes scandaliz'd; so are there divers well-disposed persons who will not know how to guide themselves, unlesse some such good men as you discover the secret, and instruct them how they may secure their greatest interest, and steere their course in this darke and uncomfortable weather. Some such discourse would be highly seasonable now that the daily sacrifice is ceasing, and that all the exercise of your functions is made criminal, that the light of Israel is quenched. Where shall we now receive the viaticum with safety? How shall we be baptiz'd? For to this passe it is come, Sir. The comfort is, the captivity had no temple, no altar, no king. But did they not observe the passover, nor circumcise? Had they no priests and prophets amongst them? Many are weake in the faith, and know not how to answer, nor whither to fly: and if upon the apotheosis of that excellent person, under a malicious representation of his martyrdom, engraven in copper, and sent me by a friend from Bruxelles, the Jesuite could so bitterly sarcasme upon the embleme:

" Projicis inventum caput, Anglia [Angla?] Ecclesia! cæsum
Si caput est, salvum corpus an esse potest?—

how thinke you will they now insult, ravage, and breake in upon the flock; for the shepheards are smitten, and the sheepe must of necessity be scattered, unlesse the greate Shepheard of soules oppose,

or some of his delegates reduce and direct us. Deare Sir, we are now preparing to take our last farewell (as they threaten) of God's service in this citty, or any where else in publique. I must confesse it is a sad consideration; but it is what God sees best, and to what we must submitt. The comfort is, 'Deus providebit.' Sir, I have not yet been so happy as to see those papers which Mr. Royston tells me are printing, but I greately rejoyce that you have so happily fortified that batterie, and I doubt not but you will maintaine the siege. for you must not be discouraged for the passions of a few. Reason is reason to me wherever I find it, much more where it conduces to a designe so salutary and necessary. At least, I wonder that those who are not convinced by y^r^ arguments, can possibly resist y^r^ charity, and y^r^ modesty: but as you have greatly subdued my education in that particular, and controversy; so am I confident tyme will render you many more proselytes. And if all doe not come so freely in with their suffrages at first, you must, with y^r^ accustomed patience, attend the event.

"S^r^, I beseech God to conduct all y^r^ labours, those of religion to others, and of love and affection to me, who remayne, "Sir, your, &c.

"Lond. 18 Mar. [qu. *Mai.*] 1655." ——.

EVELYN'S *Memoirs*, vol. ii. p. 98.

The above letter, as it now stands, is dated

Mar. 18, 1655. But, on that day, as appeared by the preceding extract from his diary, Evelyn had attended Taylor's preaching. The devout laity of the episcopal church were, therefore, not at that time deprived of the means of grace in the manner which this letter deplores. Nor does it seem likely that a letter of such a length, and written in such a manner, would be addressed to a person with whom the writer expected shortly to communicate personally, or with whom he had a few hours before communicated. Again, when he speaks of having received assurances of Taylor's safety,—when he talks of being buried in his ruins, &c., he seems to imply that Taylor was then actually in prison, or in some urgent and great danger. And, further, on the 31st of March, Taylor and Evelyn had another interview. Then, therefore, if such a letter had passed between them a few days before, was the time for Taylor to give an answer to the wish expressed in it. We find, however, that this letter remained unanswered till January in the following year, since this is clearly the one referred to in Taylor's letter of this last date, inasmuch as he there speaks of "the vile distich on the departed saint." I am, therefore, of opinion that here again, as well as in the former letter, the date has been incorrectly given, and that we should read not March but May, by which time, it is extremely probable that Taylor's imprisonment at Chepstow may have commenced.

It may be observed, that the passage in Taylor's works, to which Evelyn refers, in which the calamities of the time were said to be "harbingers of the great day," is, probably, to be met with in his "Episcopacy Asserted," (vol. vii. p. 5,) where he suggests, "that the abolition of episcopacy is the forerunner and preparatory to the great apostasy." The Oughtred, who expressed the same opinion, was William Oughtred, author of the Clavis Mathematica, and other works, and the most illustrious geometrician of his time. The church of England was, undoubtedly, in 1655, exposed to fresh and bitter persecutions, of which an interesting account will be found in the following extract from Parr's Life of Usher.

"Cromwell being now [in 1655] highly enraged against the loyal party, for their indefatigable though unsuccessful endeavours for his Majesty's restoration to his throne, after he had shewed himself very implacable and severe to the cavalier gentry, as they then called them, began now to discharge part of his rage upon the orthodox clergy, forbidding them, under great penalties, to teach schools, or to perform any part of their ministerial functions: whereupon some of the most considerable episcopal clergy, in and about London, desired my lord primate that he would use his interest with Cromwell, (since they heard he pretended a great respect for him,) that, as he granted liberty of conscience to almost all sorts

of religions, so the episcopal divines might have the same freedom of serving God in their private congregations, since they were not permitted the public churches, according to the liturgy of the church of England; and that neither the ministers, nor those that frequented that service, might be any more hindered or disturbed by his soldiers. So, according to their desires, he went and used his utmost endeavours with Cromwell, for the taking off this restraint, which was at last promised, (although with some difficulty,) that they should not be molested, provided they meddled not with any matters relating to his government. But, when the lord primate went to him a second time, to get this promise ratified and put into writing, he found him under his chyrurgeon's hand, who was dressing a great boyl which he had on his breast; so Cromwell prayed the lord primate to sit down a little, and that when he was dressed he would speak with him. Whilst this was a doing, Cromwell said to my lord primate, if this core, (pointing to the boyl), were once out, I should quickly be well; to whom the good bishop replied, 'I doubt the core lies deeper, there is a core at the heart that must be taken out, or else it will not be well.' 'Ah!' replied he, seeming unconcerned, [Quære *concerned?*] 'so there is indeed!' and sighed. But when the lord primate began to speak to him concerning the business he came about, he answered him to this effect, that he had since better considered it, having advised

with his council about it, and that they thought it not safe for him to grant liberty of conscience to those sort of men, who are restless and implacable enemies to him and his government; and so he took his leave of him, though with good words and outward civility. The lord primate, seeing it was in vain to urge it any farther, said little more to him, but returned to his lodging, very much troubled and concerned that his endeavours had met with no better success. When he was in his chamber, he said to some of his relations and myself that came to see him, 'This false man hath broken his word with me, and refuses to perform what he promised. Well, he will have little cause to glory in his wickedness,—he will not continue long. The king will return. Though I shall not live to see it, you may. The government, both in church and state, is in confusion, the Papists are advancing their projects, and making such advantages as will hardly be prevented.'"—PARR's *Life of Usher*, p. 75.

NOTE (P.)

"12 April, 1656. Mr. Berkeley and Mr. Robert Boyle, (that excellent person and great virtuoso,) Dr. Taylor and Dr. Wilkins, dined with me at Saye's Court, when I presented Dr. Wilkins with my rare burning-glasse. In the afternoone we all went to Colonel Blount's, to see his new-invented plows."

"6th May. I brought Mons^r. le Franc, a young

French Sorbonist, a proselyte, to converse with Dr. Taylor. They fell to dispute on original sin, in Latine, upon a book newly published by the Doctor, who was much satisfied with the young man."

"7th. I visited Dr. Taylor, and prevailed on him to propose Mons^r. le Franc to the bishop, that he might have orders; I having sometime before, brought him to a full consent to the church of England, her doctrine and discipline, of which he had till of late made some difficulty: so he was this day ordained both deacon and priest, by the Bishop of Meath. I paid the fees to his lordship, who was very poore and in greate want. To that necessity were our clergy reduced!"—EVELYN'S *Memoirs*, vol. i. pp. 298, 299.

What bishop it was whom Evelyn describes as the Bishop of Meath, I cannot conjecture. Certain it is that there was no bishop of that see at this time, the last, Dr. Anthony Martin, having died in great poverty at Dublin, in the year 1650, and his see not being filled up till after the Restoration.—WARE, *Hist. Ireland*, vol. i. p. 158. Ed. Harris.

## NOTE (Q.)

As the little tract in question is extremely scarce, I have subjoined some extracts, which will give the reader an idea of the manner in which the dialogue is carried on between the lady who inveighs against, and her who justifies face-painting. In the frontis-

piece to the second edition, these two disputants are represented,—the one prim, stern, and plainly apparelled, the other, in the style of Lely's portraits, patched, her hair in ringlets, with naked shoulders, a fan in her hand, and, so far as the artist was able, beautiful. The grim lady begins the conversation.

"Madam,—I am not more pleased to see you look so well, beyond what you were wont, than I am jealous (to be free with you) lest a person so esteemed as you are for modesty and piety, should use some colour or tincture to advance your complexion; which, indeed, I take to be no better than that odious and infamous way of painting, every where in all ages so much and so justly spoken against, both by God and good men; being a most ungodly practice, though generally (as they say) now used in England (more or less) by persons of quality, who, not content with nature's stock of beauty, do (not by a fine, but filthy art) add something to the advantage, as they think, of their complexions; but I fear to the deforming of their souls, and defiling of their consciences.

"Truly, madam, I absolutely think (without any mincing or distinction) all colour or complexion added to our skins and faces, beyond what is purely natural, to be a sin, as being flatly against the word of God, which I suppose you grant to be the indispensable and unchangeable rule of all moral holiness, from which we may not warp in the least

degree upon any pretensions to advance our honours, estates, healths, or beauties. First, then, if your ladyship look into 2 Kings, ix. 30, you shall see wicked Jezebel, though a queen, yet not tolerated or excused, but foully branded and heavily punished for painting her eyes or face; for which she was afterwards, by a most deformed destiny, justly devoured of dogs; as the most reverend lord primate of Armagh observes, in his larger catechism upon the seventh commandment. Which fearful stroke of divine vengeance, and censure of so learned and pious a person, (making that her painting a most meritorious and principal cause of her so sad destiny,) are sufficient, I think, to scare the most adventurous woman from any such sinful and accursed practice."

This is wretched work—but these are some of the arguments of the beaten party. Let us now examine the other side. What follows is as favourable a specimen as I can find; and is, certainly, not without wit, but I cannot persuade myself that it resembles the style of Jeremy Taylor.

"When was your ladyship scandalized with any grave and sober matron, because she laid out the combings or cuttings of her own or others' more youthful hair, when her own (now become withered and autumnal) seemed less becoming her? How many both men's and women's warmer heats in religion do now admit not only borders of foreign hair, but full and fair peruques on their heads, with-

out sindging one hair by their disputative and scrupulous zeal, which in these things of fashion, is now grown much out of fashion? Your ladyship's charity doth not reprove, but pity, those poor Vulcanists, who balance the inequality of their heels or badger-legs, by the art and help of the shoemaker; nor are those short-legged ladies thought less godly who fly to chopines, and by enlarging the phylacteries of their coats, conceal, at once, both their great defects in native brevity, and the enormous additions of their artificial heights, which make many small women walk with as much caution and danger almost, as the Turk danceth on the ropes. Who ever is so impertinent a bigot, as to find fault when the hills and dales of crooked and unequal bodies are made to meet without a miracle, by some iron bodice, or some benign bolsterings? Who fears to set straight, or hide the unhandsome warpings of bow-legs, and baker-feet? What is there as to any defect in nature, whereof ingenuous art, as a diligent handmaid waiting on its mistress, doth not study some supply or other, so far as to graff in silver plates into cracked sculls, to furnish cropt faces with artificial noses, to fill up the broken ranks and routed files of the teeth with ivory adjutants and lieutenants. Yet against all or any of these and the like reparative inventions, by which art and ingenuity studies to help and repair the defects or deformities, which God, in nature, or providence, is pleased to inflict

upon our bodies, no pen is sharpened, no pulpit is battered, no writ of rebellion, or charge of forgery and false coinage, is brought against any in the court of conscience; no poor creature (who thankfully embraceth, modestly useth, and with more cheerfulness serveth God, by means of some such help, which either takes away its reproach, or easeth its pain,) is scared with dreadful scruples, or so terrified with the threatenings of sin, hell, and damnation, as to cast away (much against their wills) that innocent succour, which God in nature and art had given them; from which they part with as much regret as the poor man did from his darling lamb, which the rich man's insolence, not his indigence, not his want, but wantonness, forced from him. Rather, we are so civilly pious in these cases, as to applaud others, no less than please ourselves in those happy delusions, whereby we conceal, or any way compensate these our deformities or defects in any kind, which seem to us less convenient, or to others less comely, in this our mortal and visible pilgrimage. Only if the face (which is the metropolis of humane majesty, and as it were the cathedral of beauty, or comliness, in the little word or polity of our bodies,) if this have sustained any injuries (as it is most exposed to them) of time, or any accident; if it stand in need of any thing that our charity and ingenuity in art can help it to, though the thing be never so

cheap, easie and harmless, either to enliven the pallid deadness of it, and to redeem it from mortmain, or to pair and match the inequal cheeks to each other, when one is as Rachel, the other as Leah; or to cover any pimples and heats, or to remove any obstructions, or to mitigate and quench excessive flushings, hereby to set off the face to such decency and equality as may innocently please ourselves and others, without any thought to displease God, (who looks not to the outward appearance, but to the heart,) what censures and whispers, yea, what outcries and clamours, what lightnings and thunders, what anathemas, excommunications, and condemnations, fill the thoughts, the pens, the tongues, the pulpits of many angry (yet it may be well meaning) Christians, both preachers and others, who are commonly more quick-sighted and offended with the least mote they fancie of adding to a lady's complexion, than with many camels of their own customary opinions and practices? Good men, though in other things, not only of fineness and neatness, but even of some falsity and pretension, they are so good-natured and indulgent as to allow their lame or their crooked wives and daughters, whatever ingenuous concealments and reparations, art and their purses can afford them; yet, as to the point of face-mending, they condemn them, like Paul's church, to sink under everlasting ruines. The most of your

plainer bred, and as it were home-spun professours and preachers, who never went far beyond their own houses, can with less equal eyes behold any woman, of never so great quality, if they see or suspect her to be adorned any whit beyond the vulgar mode, or decked with feathers more gay and goodly than those birds use, which are of their own countrey nest. In which cases of feminine dressing and adorning, no casuist is sufficient to enumerate or resolve the many intricate niceties and endless scruples of conscience, which some men's and women's more plebeian zelotry makes, as about ladies' cheeks and faces, if they appear one dram or degree more quick and rosie than they were wonted; so about the length and fashion of their clothes and hair. One while they are so perplexed about the curling of ladies' hair, that they can as hardly dis-intangle themselves as a bee entangled in honey; otherwhile they are most scrupulous mathematicians to measure the arms, wrists, necks and trains of ladies, how far they may safely venture to let their garments draw after them on the ground, or their naked skins be seen. Here, however, some men can bear the sight of the fairest faces, without so much as winking, (where the greatest face of beauty is displayed,) yet they pretend that no strength of humane virtue can endure the least assaults, or peepings of naked necks, if they make any discovery or breaking forth below the ears. Not that any modest mind pleads for

wanton prostituting of naked breasts, where the civiller customs of any countrey forbid it; but some men's rigour and fierceness is such, that if they espy any thing in the dress, clothes, or garb of women, beyond what they approve, or have been wonted to, presently the taylors, the tire-women, the gorget-makers, the seamstresses, the chamber-maids, the dressers, and all that wretched crew of obsequious attendants, are condemned as anti-christian, and only fit to wait upon the whore of Babylon. Nor do the poor ladies (though otherwise young and innocent, though as vertuous as handsome, or it possibly elder, every way exemplary for modesty, gravity, and chastity, yet they do not) without great gifts and presents (as by so many fines and heriots,) redeem themselves from some men's severe censures; and if they do take any freedom to dress and set forth themselves after the best mode and fashion, it costs them as much as the Roman captain's freedom did him; when indeed they are (as St. Paul pleaded) free-born, not only in nature, but as to grace and the new birth, which is no enemy to what fashions modesty may bear, and which decency, civility, and custom, do require."

The "Turk" mentioned in the above quotation, was, no doubt, a rope-dancer of that nation, mentioned by Evelyn as "the famous funamble Turk," who appears to have been allowed to exhibit his talents during the Commonwealth, notwithstanding the prohibition of most public amusements.

NOTE (R.)

"25 March, 1657. Dr. Taylor shewed me his MSS. of Cases of Conscience, or *Ductor Dubitantium*, now fitted for the presse.

"7th June. My fourth sonn was born, christened George, after my grandfather; Dr. Jer. Taylor officiating in the drawing-room.

"July 16. On Dr. Jer. Taylor's recommendation, I went to Eltham, to help one Moody, a young man, to that living, by my interest with the patron." Vol. i. pp. 304, 305, 306.

NOTE (T.)

"He [Heneage Finch, afterwards Earl of Nottingham,] had a brother, named Francis Finch; bred up also under E. Silvester, who was afterwards a Gent. Comm. of Balliol Coll. but, leaving it without a degree, went to London, studied the law, and became a barrister of one of the Temples; but, before he had long practised, he died, yet lives still in those several pieces of ingenuity he left behind him, wherein he falls not short of the best of poets. And because *Poeta est finitimus Oratori*, he might have proved excellent in that too, having so incomparable a precedent as his brother, Sir Heneage Finch. Among the several specimens of his poetry which I have seen, is a copy of verses before Will. Cartwright's poems, an. 1651, as there is of his brother

John: another before a book entitled *Aires and Dialogues* for *one, two, and three voices*, Lond. 1653, fol. published by Hen. Lawes. In the body of which book he hath a poem, entitled *Cælia singing*, to which the said Lawes composed an air of two parts to be sung, &c."—*Fasti*, vol. ii. p. 59.

Mr. Finch's Discourse on Friendship, is not mentioned by A. Wood, any more than that on Honour; both which, however, are extolled by Orinda, in her address (Poems, p. 19) "to the noble Palæmon on his incomparable Discourse of Friendship:" and her description of "Mr. Francis Finch, the excellent Palæmon," (ib. pp. 91, 93.)

"'Twas he that rescued gasping Friendship, when
The bell toll'd for her funeral with men;
'Twas he that made friends more than lovers burn,
And then made love to sacred friendship turn;
'Twas he turn'd Honour inward, set her free
From titles and from popularity.
Now fix'd to virtue, she begs praise of none,
But witness'd and rewarded both at home."

## NOTE (U.)

"TO THE LIEUTENANT OF THE TOWER.*

"SIR,

"I should begin with the greater apologie for this addresse, did not the consideration of the nature of

* "This was written for another gentleman, an acquaintance with the *villain* who was now lieut. of the Tower;—Baxter, by name, for I never had the least knowledge of him."—EVELYN'S *Memoirs*, vol. i. p 112.

y^r^ greate employment and my feares to importune them carry with them an excuse which, I have hope to believe, you will easily admit. But as it is an errour to be troublesome to great persons upon trifling affaires, so were it no less a crime to be silent in an occasion, wherein I may do an act of charity, and reconcile a person to your good opinion, who has deserved so well, and I thinke is so innocent. Sir, I speake in behalfe of Dr. Taylor, of whom I understand you have conceived some displeasure for the mistake of his printer; and the readiest way that I can thinke of to do him honour and bring him into esteeme with you, is to beg of you that you will please to give him leave to waite upon you, that you may learn from his owne mouth, as well as the world has done from his writings, how averse he is from any thing that he may be charged withall to his prejudice; and how greate an adversary he has ever bin, in particular, to the Popish religion, against which he has employed his pen so signally, and with such successe. And, when, by this favour you shall have don justice to all interests, I am not without faire hopes, that I shall have mutually obliged you both, by doing my endeavour to serve my worthy and pious friend, and by bringing so innocent and deserving a person into your protection; who am,

"SIR, &c.

"From Greenwich, 14 Jan. 1656-7."

"Feb. 25, 1658. Came Dr. Jeremy Taylor and my brothers, with other friends, to visite and condole with us."

"March 7. To London to hear Dr. Taylor in a private house, on xiii. Luke, 23, 24. After the sermon followed the blessed communion, of which I participated. In the afternoon, Dr. Gunning, at Excester house, expounding part of the creede."—EVELYN'S *Memoirs*, vol. i. p. 312.

It is singular that, in the minutes of the privy council, which have been examined for me by the kindness of my valued friend, H. Hobhouse, Esquire; no traces appear of any order for Taylor's imprisonment, or his appearance before them, either on this occasion, or when he was confined in the castle at Chepstow. For this omission it is not easy to account. How a supposed state criminal could be put in confinement without such an order appearing is not plain, unless we suppose that, in those arbitrary times, the committees and inferior agents of the government exercised the power of imprisonment. It is, indeed, noticeable that Evelyn's letter is addressed to the Lieutenant of the Tower himself, and that he speaks of Taylor as having incurred *his* displeasure, as if he had been the cause of his imprisonment as well as the keeper of his prison. In the Tower, however, whose records have been also con-

sulted, no warrants or commitments are preserved of a date anterior to the Restoration.

NOTE (V.)

Had Taylor forgotten the testimony of Hegesippus, concerning the grandchildren of St. Jude, the last survivors of the house of David, and, after the flesh, the kinsmen of our Lord, who were examined and dismissed without injury by Domitian? See Rowth, Reliquiæ Sacræ, vol. i. p. 196. I would rather believe that he had forgotten the story, than that he regarded as fabulous a narrative so probable in itself and so apparently authentic.

NOTE (W.)

Taylor alludes to the following passage from the neglected work of Thomas Aquinas, which may serve, at least, as a specimen of those subtleties which once exercised the best wits in Christendom. The practice of Aquinas must be borne in mind; that, namely, he states the arguments on both sides, and then moderates between them.

QUÆSTIO I. ART. 4.

*"Utrum Angeli differant in specie."*

"Ad quartum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angeli non differant in specie. Cum enim differentia sit nobilior genere, quæcunque conveniunt secundum id

quod est nobilissimum in eis, conveniunt in ultima differentia constitutione, et ita sunt eadem secundum speciem. Sed omnes Angeli conveniunt in eo quod est nobilissimum in eis,—s. in intellectualitate. Ergo omnes Angeli sunt unius speciei. Præterea magis et minus non diversificant speciem. Sed Angeli non videntur differre ab invicem nisi secundum magis et minus: prout scilicet unus aliis est simplicior et perspicacioris intellectus. Ergo Angeli non differunt specie. Præterea anima et angelus ex opposito dividuntur: sed omnes animæ sunt unius speciei, ergo et angeli. Præterea quanto aliquid est perfectius in naturâ, tanto magis debet multiplicari. Hoc autem non esset si in unâ specie esset unum tantum individuum. Ergo multi Angeli sunt unius speciei. Sed contra est, quod in his quæ sunt unius speciei, non est invenire prius et posterius, ut dicitur in 3 metaph. Sed in Angelis etiam unius ordinis sunt primi et medii et ultimi, ut dicit Dion. 10. C. angelicæ hierar. Ergo Angeli non sunt unius speciei. Conclusio.—Cum omnes spirituales substantiæ ex materiâ et formâ compositæ non sint, ejusdem non sunt speciei. Respondeo dicendum, quod quidam dixerunt omnes substantias spirituales esse unius speciei etiam animas. Alii vero quod omnes Angeli sunt unius speciei sed non animæ. Quidem vero quod omnes Angeli unius hierarchiæ, aut etiam unius ordinis. Sed hoc est impossibile. Ea n. quæ conveniunt

specie et differunt numero, conveniunt in formâ, sed distinguuntur materialiter. Si ergo Angeli non sunt compositi ex materiâ et formâ ut dictum est supra: sequitur quod impossibile sit esse duos angelos unius speciei, sicut etiam impossibile esset dicere quod essent plures albedines separatè aut plures humanitates, cùm albedines non sint plures, nisi secundum quod sunt in diversis substantiis. Si tamen Angeli haberent materiam, nec sic tamen possunt esse plures Angeli unius speciei. Sic enim oporteret quod principium distinctionis unius ab alio esset materiâ, non quidem secundum divisionem quantitatis, cum sint incorporei, sed secundum diversitatem potentiarum. Quæ quidem et diversitas materiæ causat diversitatem non solum speciei sed et generis. Ad primum ergo dicendum quod differentia est nobilior genere, sicut determinatum indeterminato et proprium communi, non autem sicut alia et aliâ naturâ. Alioquin oporteret quod omnia animalia irrationalia essent unius speciei, vel quod esset in eis aliqua alia perfectior forma quam anima sensibilis. Differunt ergo specie animalia irrationalia secundum diversos gradus determinatos naturæ sensitivæ. Et similiter omnes Angeli differunt specie secundum diversos gradus naturæ intellectivæ.

" Ad secundum dicendum, quod magis et minus secundum quod causantur ex intentione et remissione unius formæ, non diversificant specie. Sed secundum quod causantur ex formis diversorum graduum,

sic diversificant speciem: sicut si dicamus, quod ignis est perfectior ære. Et hoc modo Angeli diversificantur secundum magis et minus. Ad tertium dicendum quod bonum speciei præponderat bono individui. Unde multo melius est quod multiplicentur species in Angelis, quam quod multiplicentur individua in unâ specie. Ad quartum dicendum, quod multiplicatio secundum numerum cum in infinitum protendi possit, non intenditur ab agenti, sed sola multiplicatio secundum speciem ut supra dictum est. Unde perfectio naturæ Angelicæ requirit multiplicationem specierum, non autem multiplicationem individuorum in unâ specie."—S. THOM. AQUIN. *Summa Totius Theologiæ*, pars i. p. 97.

NOTE (X.)

These facts appear from a letter of Lord Conway's, dated June 15, 1658, of which the following is an extract. It is addressed to Major George Rawdon, who had married his sister, and who, from his residence and influence in Ireland, might materially contribute to the fulfilment of Lord Conway's wishes. It should seem that Major Rawdon had, in answer to a previous application, given a discouraging account of the state of the country.

"DEAR BROTHER,

"That which you writ me in your letter of the 2d of this month, concerning Dr. Taylor, was sufficient to have discouraged him and all his friends from any

further thoughts of that country; but, I thank God, I went upon a principle not to be repented of, for I had no interest or passion in what I did for him, but rather some reluctancy. What I pursued was, to do an act of piety towards him, and an act of piety towards all such as are truly disposed to virtue in those parts, for I am certain he is the choicest person in England appertaining to the conscience; and, let others blemish him how they please, yet all I have written of him is true. He is a man of excellent parts and an excellent life; but in regard that this is not powerful to purchase his quiet, I shall tell you what is done in relation to that. Dr. Petty hath written by him to Dr. Harrison and several others, and promist to provide him a purchase of land, at great advantage, and many other intimate kindnesses, wherein your advice will be askt. Dr. Cox, a physician, and a very ingenious man, who hath married the chancellor's sister, hath written on his behalf very passionately, and some of as near relation to my Lord Peepes hath recommended him to him. Serjeant Twisden, one of the eminentest lawyers in England, who married Sir Matthew Tomlinson's sister, hath written to him very earnestly, and so hath his wife also. Mr. Hall, an understanding man, and always one of the knights for Lincolnshire, hath recommended him to his friend Mr. Bury; and so hath Mr. Bacon, one of the masters of request, done for him to my Lord Chief Baron. But, besides all

this, my Lord Protector hath given him a pass and a protection for himself and his family, under his sign manuel and privy signet. So that I hope it will not be treason to look upon him and to own him. Dr. Loftus is his friend. I have sent you and my sister a box of pills, by Dr. Taylor, of the same proportion as that I sent last summer.

"Your affectionate brother,

"Kensington, June 15, 1658." "E. CONWAY."

NOTE (Y.)

Edwards, in his Gangræna, speaks of the Perfectists or Perfectionists in the same category with the most detested heretics of his time. "All the sects, *yea, the worst of them*, as the Antiscripturists, Arians, Anti-trinitarians, *Perfectists*, being Independents and Separatists." The Dr. Gell, who appears to have favoured them, was, probably, "Robert Gell, D.D. of Pampisford in Cambridgeshire, Rector of St. Mary, Aldermary, and sometime chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury; which doctor died in the very beginning of the year (twenty-fifth March or thereabouts) 1665."—*Athenæ Oxon.* vol. iii. col. 562.

NOTE (Z.)

"I received a letter yesterday from Dr. Taylor: it hath almost broke my heart. Mr. Tandy hath exhibited articles against him to the lord deputy and council, so simple, (as Colonel Hill writes,) that it is

impossible it should come to any thing: the greatest scandal being, that he christened Mr. Bryer's child with the sign of the cross. I have written to Hyrne to supply him with money for his vindication, as if it were my own business. I hope, therefore, when you come over, you will take him [Tandy] off from persecuting me, since none knows better than yourself whether I deserve the same at his hands. I would have sent you the Doctor's letter to me, but that I know not whether this will ever come to you. The quarrel is, it seems, because he thinks Dr. Taylor more welcome to Hillsborough than himself.

"Kensington, June 14, 1659." "E. CONWAY."

To this same conduct of Tandy's Lord Conway elsewhere alludes, with a similar resentment: "Mr. Tandy may have enough of these [Anabaptists and Quakers] to set himself against, without troubling his peaceable and best neighbours." — RAWDON *Papers*, p. 199.

NOTE (AA.)

The first work to which Taylor alludes is "St. Chrysostom's Golden Book for the Education of Children, out of the Greeke." 1659. 12mo. The other work alluded to must have been in MS., since I cannot find that Evelyn ever published any account of his travels. The authors of the Biographia Britannica, (vol. v. p. 610,) say, "It is much to be

regretted that a work so entertaining as the history of his travels would have been, appeared, even to so indefatigable a person as he was, a task too laborious for him to undertake: for we should there have seen clearly, and in a true light, many things in reference to Italy which are now very indistinctly and partially represented; and we should have also met with much new matter never touched before, and of which we shall now, probably, never hear at all."

NOTE (BB.)

This was Thomas Piers, or Pierce, first fellow of Magdalen, afterwards rector of Brington, in Northamptonshire, then president of his own College, and lastly dean of Salisbury. He is described by Wood as "a person well read in authors, whether civil or prophane, of a florid style, a zealous son of the church of England, though originally a Calvinist; but, above all, a most excellent preacher, whether in the English or the Latin tongue."—Wood, *Athen.* vol. iv. p. 299. The particular works alluded to by Taylor are, 1. "An Additional Advertisement of Mr. Baxter's Book, entitled the Grotian Religion discovered, &c.," printed in the same volume with "Self-Condemnation exemplified in Mr. Whitfield, Mr. Barlee, and Mr. Hickman; with occasional Reflections on Calvin, Beza, Zuinglius, Piscator, Rivet, and Bullock; but more especially on Dr. W. Twisse and Mr. T. Hobbes." Lond. 1650, quarto. 2. "The

New Discoverer discovered; by way of Answer to Mr. Baxter his pretended Discovery of the Grotian Religion, with the several Subjects therein contained. Lond. 1659, quarto."—Pierce seems to have been a pungent and caustic writer, well read in the Quinquarticular controversy, and fearless in the defence of the Church of England, even during her time of greatest depression. He must, however, have, in some degree, complied with the ruling powers, since he held his living unmolested during the whole of the Civil War and the Usurpation.

## NOTE (CC.)

"Herbert Thorndyke, prebend of Westminster, and sometimes fellow of Trin. Coll. in Cambridge," died in July 1672. He is mentioned by Wood, *Athen.* vol. ii. pp. 302 and 4. But of his literary labours I know nothing; nor, from Taylor's estimate, do they seem worth much inquiry.

## NOTE (DD.)

For a beautiful "Prayer, to be said by Debtors and all Persons, obliged whether by Crime or Contract," see the "Holy Living," vol. vi. p. 177. It contains many expressions which prove it to have been in frequent use with Taylor himself, and to have been prompted by the necessities of his own condition.

NOTE (EE.)

*Extract from the Oliverian Minutes of the Year* 1659.

*Record Tower, Dublin Castle.*

"Dr. Taylor.

"Ordered,

"That Lt. Coll. Bryan Smyth Governor of Carrickfergus do forthwith upon sight hereof cause the body of Dr. Jeremiah Taylor to be sent up to Dublin under safe custody, to the end he may make his personall appearance before the said Com^rs to answer unto such things as shall be objected ag^t him in behalf of the Com'onwealth. Dated att Dublin y^e 11th of August 1659.

"Signed, THO. HERBERT, Sec^r."

NOTE (FF.)

These troubles were the rising of Sir George Booth and the gentry of Cheshire and the neighbouring counties, after the death of Cromwell, in July 1659. The usual way between London and Ireland was thus rendered impassable, and the severities which were exercised on the loyalists after their defeat were likely to render men unwilling to become the bearers of any communication with a person of such known political principles as Jeremy Taylor.—See HUME, vol. vii. pp. 300, 301, 302.

NOTE (GG.)

The works here alluded to are, 1st, Evelyn's "Apology for the Royal Party, written in a Letter to a

Person in the late Council of State; with a Touch at the pretended Plea of the Army." London, 1659, quarto; and "Elysium Britannicum," a projected Treatise on Gardening, in three books, which was never completed.—See EVELYN's *Memoirs*, vol. ii. p. 90.

## NOTE (HH.)

"Here I cannot but instance two acts of the Presbyterians, by which, if their humour and spirit were not enough discovered and known, their want of ingenuity and integrity would be manifest; and how impossible it is, for men who would not be deceived, to depend on either. When the declaration had been delivered to the ministers, there was a clause in it, in which the king declared "his own constant practice of the Common Prayer," and that he would take it well from those who used it in their churches, that the common people might be again acquainted with the piety, gravity, and devotion of it, and which he thought would facilitate their living in a good neighbourhood together—or words to that effect. When they had considered the whole some days, Mr. Calamy, and some other ministers deputed by the rest, came to the chancellor to redeliver it into his hands. They acknowledged 'the king had been very gracious to them in his concessions; though he had not granted all that some of their brethren wished, yet they were contented;' only

desired him that 'he would prevail with the king that the clause mentioned before might be left out; which'—they protested, 'was moved by them for the king's own end; and that they might shew their obedience to him, and resolution to do him service. For they were resolved themselves to do what the king wished, and first to reconcile the people, who for near twenty years had not been acquainted with that form, by informing them, that it contained much piety and devotion, and might be lawfully used; and then, that they would begin to use it themselves, and by degrees accustom the people to it. Which,' they said, 'would have a better effect than if the clause were in the declaration; for they should be thought in their persuasions to comply only with the king's declaration, and to merit from his majesty, and not to be moved from the conscience of the duty: and so they should take that occasion to manifest their zeal to please the king. And they feared there would be other ill consequences from it, by the waywardness of the common people, who were to be treated with skill, and would not be prevailed upon all at once.' The king was to be present the next morning, to hear the declaration read the last time before both parties; and then the chancellor told him, in the presence of all the rest, what the ministers had desired; which they again enlarged upon, with the same protestations of their resolutions, in such a manner that his majesty believed they

meant honestly, and the clause was left out. But the declaration was no sooner published, than, observing that the people were generally satisfied with it, they sent their emissaries abroad; and many of their letters were intercepted, and particularly a letter from Mr. Calamy to a leading minister in Somersetshire, whereby he advised and intreated him, 'that he and his friends would continue and persist in the use of *the Directory*, and by no means admit the Common Prayer in their churches; for that he made no question but that they should prevail further with the king than he had yet consented to in his declaration.'"

"The other instance was, that, as soon as the declaration was printed, the king received a petition in the name of the ministers of London, and many others of the same opinion with them, who had subscribed that petition, amongst whom none of those who had attended the king in those conferences had their names. They gave his majesty humble thanks 'for the grace he had vouchsafed to shew in his declaration, which they received as an earnest of his future goodness and condescension in granting all those other concessions which were absolutely necessary for the liberty of their conscience;' and desired, with importunity and ill manners, 'that the wearing the surplice, and the using the cross in baptism, might be absolutely abolished out of the church, as being scandalous to all men of tender consciences.' From these two instances, all men

may conclude, that nothing but a severe execution of the law can prevail upon that classis of men to conform to government." — CLARENDON'S *Life*, pp. 75, 76.

I certainly do not consider Clarendon's inference as an accurate one. The duplicity or bigotry of a few leading individuals can be no good argument against using all just and reasonable means to conciliate a numerous and powerful party, the majority of whom must be, like other men, to be subdued by kindness, and satisfied when their complaints are attended to. Nor is there any method so likely to destroy the consequence of the obnoxious individuals themselves, as a removal of the real or imaginary grievances which constitute the strength of their cause, and supply them with arms against the government. But we know how much mankind are, even in spite of themselves, deterred from a perseverance in conciliatory measures by the unthankful manner in which those measures are received: nor have they, who will make no concessions, any right to complain that they do not obtain fresh privileges.

## NOTE (II.)

The inscription on the communion plate is as follows:—

"In Ministerium SS. Mysteriorum
In Ecclesia Christi Redemptoris
De Dromore
Deo dedit humillima Domina
Ancilla D. Joanna Taylor."—BONNLY, p. 323

Here, it will be observed, the lady is called Joanna, without any distinctive mark; but as Mrs. Taylor herself bore that name, she is more likely to have been the giver than her daughter: more particularly since Joanna, the daughter, had two elder sisters, and can have been little more than a child at this time. Mrs. Taylor was also an heiress, so that she may well have retained some portion of her property in her own hands, so as to make the present really hers.

NOTE (JJ.)

"At Michaelmas, 1662, Francis Taverner, about twenty-five years old, a lusty proper stout fellow, then servant at large, (afterwards porter,) to the Lord Chichester, Earl of Donegal, at Belfast in the north of Ireland, county of Antrim, and diocese of Connor, riding late in the night from Hilbrough homeward, near Drum Bridge, his horse, though of good metal, suddenly made a stand; and he, supposing him to be taken with the staggers, alighted to bloud him in the mouth, and presently mounted again. As he was setting forward, there seemed to pass by him two horsemen, though he could not hear the treading of their feet, which amazed him. Presently there appeared a third in a white coat, just at his elbow, in the likeness of James Haddock, formerly an inhabitant in Malone, where he died near five years before. Whereupon Taverner asked him in the name of God who he was? He replied,

'I am James Haddock, and you may call to mind by this token: that about five years ago, I and two other friends were at your father's house, and you, by your father's appointment, brought us some nuts; and therefore be not afraid,' says the apparition. Whereupon Taverner, remembering the circumstances, thought it might be Haddock; and those two, who passed by before him, he thought to be his two friends with him when he gave them nuts, and courageously asked him why he appeared to him rather than any other. He answered, because he was a man of more resolution than others: and if he would ride his way with him, he would acquaint him with a business he had to deliver him, which Taverner refused to do, and would go his own way (for they were now at a quadrivial), and so rode on homewards. But immediately on their departure there arose a great wind, and withal he heard very hideous screeches and noises, to his great amazement; but riding forward as fast as he could, he at last heard the cocks crow to his comfort; he alighted from his horse, and falling to prayer, desired God's assistance, and so got safe home.

"The night after there appeared again to him the likeness of James Haddock, and bid him go to Elenor Welsh (now the wife of Davis, living at Malone, but formerly the wife of the said James Haddock, by whom she had an onely son, to whom the said James Haddock had by his will given a

lease, which he held of the Lord Chichester, of which the son was deprived by Davis, who had married his mother,) and to ask her if her maiden name was not Elenor Welsh; and if it were, to tell her, that it was the will of her former husband James Haddock that their son should be righted in the lease. But Taverner, partly loath to gain the ill will of his neighbours, and partly thinking he should not be credited but looked on as deluded, long neglected to do his message; till having been every night for about a month's space haunted with this apparition in several forms, every night more and more terrible, (which was usually preceded by an unusual trembling over his whole body, and great change of countenance manifest to his wife, in whose presence frequently the apparition was, though not visible to her;) at length he went to Malone to Davis's wife, and askt whether her maiden name was not Elenor Welch; if it was, he had something to say to her. She replied, there was another Elenor Welch besides her. Hereupon Taverner returned without delivering his message. The same night, being fast asleep in his bed, (for the former apparitions were as he sate by the fire with his wife,) by something pressing upon him he was awakened, and saw again the apparition of James Haddock in a white coat as at other times, who asked him if he had delivered his message? He answered, he had been there with Elenor Welch. Upon which, the apparition looking more pleasantly

upon him, bid him not be afraid, and so vanished in a flash of brightness. But some nights after, (he having not delivered his message,) he came again, and appearing in many formidable shapes, threatened to tear him in pieces if he did not do it. This made him leave his house, where he dwelt in the mountains, and betake himself to the town of Belfast, where he sate up all night at one Pierce's house, a shoemaker, accompanied with the said Pierce and a servant or two of the Lord Chichester, who were desirous to hear or see the spirit. About midnight, as they were all by the fire-side, they beheld Taverner's countenance to change, and a trembling to fall on him, who presently espyed the apparition in a room opposite to him where he sate, and took up the candle and went to it, and resolutely asked him in the name of God wherefore it haunted him? It replied, because he had not delivered the message, and withal threatened to tear him in pieces if he did not do it speedily; and so changing itself into many prodigious shapes, it vanisht in white like a ghost. Whereupon Francis Taverner became much dejected and troubled, and next day went to the Lord Chichester's house, and with tears in his eyes related to some of the family the sadness of his condition. They told it to my Lord's chaplain, Mr. James South, who came presently to Taverner, and being acquainted of his whole story, advised him to go this present time to Malone to deliver punctually his message, and promised to

go along with him. But first they went to Dr. Lewis Downs, then minister of Belfast, who, upon hearing the relation of the whole matter, doubted at first the truth of it, attributing it rather to melancholy than any thing of reality. But being afterwards fully satisfied of it, the only scruple remaining was, whether it might be lawful to go on such a business, not knowing whose errand it was; since, though it was a real apparition of some spirit, yet it was questionable whether of a good or a bad spirit. Yet the justice of the cause, (it being the common report the youth was wronged,) and other considerations prevailing, he went with them. So they three went to Davis's house, where the woman being desired to come to them, Taverner did effectually do his message, by telling her, that he could not be at quiet for the ghost of her former husband James Haddock, who threatened to tear him in pieces if he did not tell her she must right John Haddock, her son by him, in a lease wherein she and Davis, her now husband, had wronged him. This done, he presently found great quietness in his mind; and, thanking the gentlemen for their company, advice, and assistance, he departed thence to his brother's house at Drum Bridge; where, about two nights after, the aforesaid apparition came to him again, and, more pleasantly than formerly, askt if he had delivered his message? He answered, he had done it fully. It replied, that he must do the message to the exe-

cutors also, that the business might be perfected. At this meeting, Taverner asked the spirit if Davis would do him any hurt; to which it answered at first somewhat doubtfully; but at length threatened Davis, if he attempted any thing to the injury of Taverner, and so vanisht away in white.

"The day following, Dr. Jeremie Taylor, Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore, was to go to keep court at Dromore, and commanded me, who was then secretary to him, to write for Taverner to meet him there, which he did. And there, in the presence of many, he examined Taverner strictly in this strange scene of Providence, as my Lord stil'd it; and by the account given him, both by Taverner and others who knew Taverner, and much of the former particulars, his Lordship was satisfied that the apparition was true and real; but said no more there to him, because at Hilbrough, three miles from thence on his way home, my Lord was informed that my Lady Conway and other persons of quality were coming purposely to hear his Lordship examine the matter. So Taverner went with us to Hilbrough; and there, to satisfy the curiosity of the fresh company, after asking many things anew, and some over again, my Lord advised him, the next time the spirit appeared, to ask him these questions:—'Whence are you? Are you a good or a bad spirit? Where is your abode? What station do you hold? How are you regimented in the other world? And what is the

reason that you appear for the relief of your son in so small a matter, when so many widows and orphans are oppressed in the world, being defrauded of greater matters, and none from thence of their relations appear as you do, to right them?'

"That night Taverner was sent for to Lisburne, to my Lord Conway's, three miles from Hilbrough, on his way home to Belfast, where he was again strictly examined in the presence of many good men and women of the aforesaid matter, who was ordered to lie at my Lord Conway's all night; and about nine or ten o'clock at night, standing by the fire-side with his brother and many others, his countenance changed, and he fell into a trembling, the usual prognostic of the apparition; and being loath to make any disturbance in his lordship's house, he and his brother went out into the court, where he saw the spirit coming over the wall; which approaching nearer, askt him if he had done his message to the executors also? He replied he had, and wondered it should still haunt him. It replied, he need not fear, for it would do him no hurt, nor trouble him any more, but the executors, if he did not see the boy righted. Here his brother put him in mind to ask the spirit what the bishop bid him, which he did presently. But it gave him no answer, but crawled on its hands and feet over the wall again, and so vanisht in white, with a most melodious harmony.

"Note (1) That Pierce, at whose house, and in

whose presence the apparition was, being askt whether he saw the spirit, said he did not, but thought at that time he had a mist all over his eyes. (2) What was then spoken to Taverner was in so low and hollow a voice, that they could not understand what it said. (3) At Pierce's house it stood just in the entry of a door, and as a maid passed by to go in at the door, Taverner saw it go aside and give way to the maid, though she saw it not. (4) That the lease was hereupon disposed to the boy's use. (5) The spirit, at the last appearing at my Lord Conway's house, revealed somewhat to Taverner, which he would not discover to any of us that askt him.

"This Taverner, with all the persons and places mentioned in the story, I knew very well, and all wise and good men did believe it, especially the Bishop, and Dean of Connor, Dr. Rust.

"Witness your humble servant,

"THOMAS ALCOCK."

"David Hunter, neat-herd, at the bishop's house at Portmore; there appeared to him one night, carrying a log of wood into the dairy, an old woman, which amazed him, for he knew her not; but the fright made him throw away his log of wood, and run into the house. The next night she appeared again to him, and he could not chuse but follow her all night, and so almost every night for near three quarters of a year. Whenever she came, he must go with

her through the woods at a good round rate, and the poor fellow looked as if he was bewitched, and travelled off his legs. And when in bed with his wife, if she appeared, he must rise and go. And because his wife could not hold him in his bed, she would go too, and walk after him till day, though she see nothing. But his little dog was so well acquainted with the apparition, that he would follow her as well as his master. If a tree stood in her walk, he observed her always to go through it. In all this while she spoke not.

" But one day the said David going over a hedge into the high-way, she came just against him; and he cryed out, ' Lord bless me! would I was dead; shall I never be delivered from this misery?' At which — ' And the Lord bless me too,' says she; ' It was very happy you spake first, for till then I had no power to speak, though I have followed you so long.' — ' My name,' says she, ' is Margaret ——. I lived here before the war, and had one son by my husband. When he died I married a soldier, by whom I had several children, which that former son maintained, else we must have all starved. He lives beyond the Baun Water; pray go to him, and bid him dig under such a hearth, and there he shall find 28s. Let him pay what I owe in such a place, and the rest to the charge unpaid at my funeral; and go to my son that lives here, which I had by my latter husband, and tell him that he lives a wicked and a dissolute life,

and is very unnatural and ungrateful to his brother that maintained him; and if he does not mend his life, God Almighty will destroy him.'

"David Hunter told her, he never knew her. 'No,' says she; 'I died seven years before you came into the country.' But for all that, if he would do her message, she should never hurt him. But he deferred doing as the apparition bid him; and she appeared the night after as he lay in bed, and struck him on the shoulder very hard; at which he cryed out, and asked her if she did not promise she would not hurt him. She said, that was if he did her message; if not, she would kill him. He told her, he could not go now, by reason the waters were out. She said, she was content he should stay till they were abated; but charged him afterwards not to fail her. So he did her errand, and afterwards she appeared and gave him thanks. 'For now,' said she, 'I shall be at rest; therefore pray you lift me up from the ground, and I will trouble you no more.' So David Hunter lifted her up from the ground, and, as he said, she felt just like a bag of feathers in his arms. So she vanished, and he heard most delicate musick as she went off, over his head; and he never was more troubled.

"This account the poor fellow gave us every day as the apparition spoke to him; and my Lady Conway came to Portmore, where she asked the fellow the same questions, and many more. This I know to be

true, being all the while with my Lord of Downe, and the fellow but a poor neatherd there.

"THOMAS ALCOCK."

GLANVILLE'S *Sadducismus Triumphatus; edited by More.* Lond. 1682, pp. 243 — 253.

"I cannot but animadvert upon what is here expressed concerning the questions which the bishop would needs have propounded to and resolved by this spectre. I am persuaded that the apostle Paul, who speaks of man's *intruding into those things which he hath not seen*, Col. ii. 18, would hardly have given such counsel as the bishop did. One of his questions, (viz. Are you a good or a bad spirit?) seems to be a needless and impertinent inquiry; for good angels never appear in the shape of dead men, but evil and wicked spirits have oftentimes done so. His other queries savour too much of vain curiosity: they bring to mind what is by that great historian Thuanus, (lib. 130, p. 1136,) reported concerning Peter Cotton, the Jesuit; who, having a great desire to be satisfied about some questions which no man living could resolve him in, he applied himself to a maid who was possessed with a devil, charging the spirit in her to resolve his proposals. Some of which were *of this world:* e. g. he desired the devil, if he could, to tell him when Calvinism would be extinguished; and what would be the most effectual means to turn the kingdom of England from the Protestant to the Popish

religion? What would be the issue of the wars and great designs then on foot in the world? — Other of his inquiries respected the *old world*; e. g. How Noah could take the living creatures that were brought into the ark? Who those sons of God were that loved the daughters of men? Whether serpents went upon feet before Adam's fall? &c. Some of his questions respected the *other world*. He would have the spirit resolve him, How long the fallen angels were in heaven before they were cast out from thence? And what is the most evident place in the Scripture to prove that there is a purgatory? Who are the seven spirits that stand before the throne of God? Who is the king of the archangels? Where Paradise is? Now let the reader judge whether Dr. Taylor's questions, when he would have the spirit resolve him, Where is your abode? What station do you hold? How are you regimented in the other world? &c., be not as curious as some of the Jesuit's. Wise men thought it tended much to the disreputation of Peter Cotton; when, through his incognitant leaving the book wherein his inquiries of the dæmon were written, with a friend, the matter came to be divulged. I cannot think that Dr. Taylor's secretary, his publishing these curiosities of his lord, hath added much to his credit among sound and judicious persons. There is a tragical passage related in the story of the dæmon, which for three months molested the house of Mr. Perreaud, a Protestant minister in Matiscon.

One in the room would needs be propounding needless questions for the devil to answer, though Mr. Perreaud told him of the danger in it. After a deal of discourse, the devil said unto him, 'You should have hearkened to the minister's good counsel, who told you, that you ought not to ask curious questions of the devil; yet you would do it, and now I must school you for your pains.' Presently upon which the man was, by an invisible hand, plucked up by his thumb, and twirled round and thrown down upon the floor, and so continued in most grievous misery. I hope, then, that none will be emboldened from the bishop's advice, to inquire at the mouth of devils, or of apparitions, until such time as they know whether they are devils or no" — INCREASE MATHER'S *Diary for the Recording of Illustrious Providences.* 12mo. Boston, 1684. pp. 223—229.

Mather does not seem to have perceived (indeed if he had, it would not have diminished his displeasure,) the drift and object of that sort of cross-examination to which Taylor wished to subject the apparition, nor that it was intended merely to perplex and expose the person who, as he suspected, played the part of spectre. It is singular that the practice, so usual with the Romish exorcists, of asking strange and curious questions of exorcised persons, "cunningly to get out of thedevil the confession of some article of faith, for the edification of the standers-by," — is exposed by Taylor himself, in one of his contro-

versial works, in a strain of powerful satire, which will well repay the reader who may refer to it. Mather, who was a steady and most intolerant believer in the reality of such visitations, and who trusted in exorcisms as implicitly as Peter Cotton the Jesuit, (provided only those exorcisms were after the model of the directory, and uttered by a minister in a black cloak instead of a cope and surplice,) would have thought his wit, indeed, grievously out of place; but even Mather himself would have had some difficulty in answering satisfactorily the decision with which he winds up his pleasantries.

"The casting out of devils is a miraculous power, and given at first for the confirmation of Christian faith, as the gifts of tongues and healing were; and, therefore, we have reason to believe, that because it is not an ordinary power, the ordinary exorcisms cast out no more devils than extreme unction cures sicknesses. We do not envy to any one any grace of God, but wish it were more modestly pretended, unless it could be more evidently proved. Origen condemned this whole procedure of conjuring devils long since: and St. Chrysostom spake soberly and truly, We poor wretches cannot drive away the flies, much less devils." — *Dissuasive from Popery*, vol. x. pp. 237 — 238.

NOTE (KK.)

That his health was broken appears by the anxiety

expressed by Lord Conway, (who was a steady believer in the wonderful cures effected by Valentine Greatraiks,) that this singular person should be admitted to operate upon him. "I had a letter also from my brother Francis. I am confident Mr. Greatrix would recover him or *the Bishop of Down*, for I do pretty well know what distempers he can cure, and what he cannot cure." — RAWDON *Papers*, p. 214. Of Mr. Greatraiks and his miracles, a strange account is given in a letter from Taylor's friend, Dean Rust, to the learned and pious, but superstitious Glanvill, *Sadducismus Triumphatus*, pp. 81 — 83. See also Henry More's Scholia on sect. 58. of his *Enthusiasmus Triumphatus*, and "A brief Account of Mr. Valentine Greatraiks, and divers of the strange Cures by him lately performed, in a letter addressed to the Hon. —— Boyle." London, 1666. The strangest part of the story is the good character and good sense of Greatraiks, who seems to have given no symptoms either of enthusiasm or imposture, and who, though he demanded £155. for his journey into England, to try his powers on the Lady Conway, (RAWDON *Papers*, p. 207,) in general accepted no reward for the benefits which he conferred. After all, in an age of metallic tractors and animal magnetism, we have no right to wonder at the credulity of our grandfathers and grandmothers.

## NOTE (LL.)

It is my duty to acknowledge that this part of

Lady [redacted] statement is clogged with many difficulties, not unlikely, perhaps, to occur in the narrative of a person, who, at an advanced age, gives details of events which happened before she was born, but which prevent our receiving all the circumstances which she relates with unhesitating assent. Thus, she calls the officer who was killed in a duel, "her uncle [redacted];" and says, that the duel took place at "Oxford." But, if a duel so remarkable had occurred at Oxford, it is almost certain that Anthony Wood would have taken some notice of it. And, further, it appears from the Register, that Edward Taylor, son of the bishop, was buried, not at Oxford, but at Lisburn, in March, 1661,—too soon to make it probable that he could have attained the rank of captain in the Guards, inasmuch as, at that time, the government were rather occupied in disbanding the old army than in raising or new modelling another. It is, therefore, most reasonable to apprehend that she had confounded names and dates, and given an erroneous version of a story which might well be true in the main, though it neither happened at the place nor to the person whom she supposed. A similar mistake occurs in her account of her uncle Charles, whom she asserts to have taken a master's degree in the university of Dublin. This, I have ascertained, he certainly never did. But, though I cannot place implicit confidence in the circumstances of her story I cannot think myself justified in withholding all credence from it, since it

is, after all, as good authority as can generally expected in cases of family tradition.

## NOTE (MM.)

"Feb. 24, 1680. To the Royal Society, where I met an Irish bishop and his lady, who was daughter to my worthy and pious friend, Dr. Jeremy Taylor, late bishop of Down and Connor. They came to see the Repository; she seemed to be a knowing woman, beyond the ordinary talent of her sex."—EVELYN *Memoirs*, vol. i. p. 217.

## NOTE (NN.)

The son of Archbishop Marsh, by Mary Taylor, was afterwards dean of Down; but I have been able to discover nothing more concerning him, except that he also had a son who left five children; 1. Francis, still living, and father of a numerous family, who is in possession of Bishop Taylor's watch, given him by king Charles; 2. Robert, in holy orders, and living in 1817; 3. Digby, also in orders, and fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, who died August 12, 1791; 4. Jeremy, also deceased, who had the original of the picture whence Mr. Bonney's print is taken; and 5. a daughter, married to Mr. Simon Digby, and living in 1817.

Of Digby, the third son, the following character appeared at the time of his death, in the public

papers. For it, as well as all the preceding particulars concerning the Marsh family, I am indebted to Mr. Bonney's MS. Dr. Marsh, I can believe to have been not unworthy of such an ancestor as Jeremy Taylor, though, probably, he himself, and, certainly, his great-great-grandfather, would have been surprised at some of those peculiar flowers of eloquence which distinguish the eulogium before us.

"On Friday last, (August 12, 1791,) died at his chambers in the College, (Dublin), of a severe indisposition, which he bore with becoming fortitude and resignation, the Rev. Digby Marsh, D.D., senior fellow of Trinity College, professor of modern history, register [registrar] of the university, and member of the Royal Irish Academy.

"Whether we consider the elevation of his mind, the strength of his talents, or the number of his virtues, we cannot hesitate to pronounce him among the first characters of which the university, or, perhaps, the nation, could boast.

"Calm, deliberate, and reserved — his calmness was fortitude, his deliberation wisdom, his reserve modesty.

"That magnanimity which raised him above the reach of passion, gave to every action of his life decision and intrepidity; and, whilst he seemed slow in deciding, he was retarded not by the dulness of conception, but by the range of his sagacity and the comprehension of his views.

"The austerity of his deportment, the effect not of pride, but of constitution, was softened into affability by a native gentleness and benevolence which could not be disguised; and through a severity of manner, perhaps not ill-suited to the serious dignity of his mind, beamed the mildest effusions of a generous and feeling heart.

"His affections were not easily excited; but they were strong, steady, and permanent; and whilst he scorned to make *professions* of regard, his actions proved him a sincere and disinterested friend.

"Noble and elevated in his sentiments, he has left behind him a character unsullied by a single mean or dishonourable act.

"Nor, indeed, was it possible that a man, the independence of whose virtue rested upon itself, and, far from courting, rather shunned applause, could have deviated from the strict path which honour and conscience prescribe. Endowed with singular powers of understanding, he sought not their display.

"His genius was too proud to stoop to fame; too modest to hope for it. But the gratitude of that place which has been enriched by his talents and improved by his virtues, will pay to his memory that tribute of admiration and praise, which the diffidence that ever attends real abilities would have prevented him from accepting in his life.

"The governors of Trinity College unanimously resolved, that the late much-lamented Dr. Marsh

should be interred in the College Chapel, with all academical honours, and with every mark of respect that could testify their just sense of his superior merit. But Dr. Marsh's family declined the offer, with many expressions of thankfulness for the honour intended their relation, whom they rather chose should be buried privately in their own family vault."

Of Joanna Taylor, and her descendants, the following account is taken from Mr. Todd Jones's MSS. and information furnished by his surviving sisters. Joanna, it will be recollected, was married to Edward Harrison, of Maralave, esquire, member of parliament for Lisburn. By him she had four sons and two daughters: 1. Michael Harrison, muster-master-general of Ireland, and master of the staple in that kingdom, which he inherited from his grandfather, to whom it was granted by Charles the Second. The illuminated patent is yet in the possession of the family, but its privileges were taken away in the 12th year of king William. He represented Belfast in the Irish parliament, and died young without issue.—2. Jeremiah Taylor Harrison, commissary-general of Ireland, and member of parliament for Knocktopher. Of all the grandchildren of Bishop Taylor, this his namesake was accounted to bear the strongest resemblance to him in person, countenance, and disposition; but, being a Whig, he has fallen under the lash of Swift in the "Legion Club." It is, perhaps, singular that Taylor's descendants should have been

Whigs; but still more so that the one who most resembled him should be so handed down to posterity by the pen of a malicious satirist.

"There sit Clements, Dilkes, and *Harrison;*
How they swagger from their garrison;
Such a triplet could you tell
Where to find on this side hell?
Harrison, and Dilkes, and Clements,
Keeper, see they have their payments!
Every mischief's in their hearts;
If they fail, 'tis want of parts!"

He married Mary, daughter of the secretary Vernon, and sister to the admiral of the same name, and died at Brook Hill, near Lisburn, also without issue. 3. Francis Harrison, representative for the county of Carlow, who inhabited the property of both his brothers, which he largely increased by an advantageous purchase from the crown of the estates of Castlemartin, forfeited by Sir Maurice Eustace, late lord chancellor of Ireland, under king James. In 1724 he became a partner in a banking-house at Dublin, then esteemed the most flourishing in the British islands. In 1729, however, Mr. Harrison dying suddenly, intestate, and with the whole of his property unsettled, the affairs of the bank became greatly involved, and a burden, for which he was extremely ill-fitted, devolved on, 4. his youngest brother, Marsh Harrison, captain in the army, a weak and dissipated man, who died soon after, a

victim to various excesses. The bank failed, and a great part of the Harrison estates were involved in the ruin. A considerable surplus, however, remained to, 5. Mary, the survivor of the whole family; married, first, to colonel Francis Columbine, by whom she had two daughters; Frances, married to William Todd, esquire, and Harrison, married to Sir Christopher Hales, of Lincolnshire. After colonel Columbine's death, his widow again married Sir Cecil Wray, of Summer Castle and Brampstone, in Lincolnshire. By him she had another daughter, Albina Casey, who, in 1730, married lord Vere Bertie, second son of Robert, duke of Ancaster.—6. The sixth of bishop Taylor's grandchildren was Anne, who married colonel John Pacey, secretary to the duke of Ormond, and died without children.

Lady Wray, whose letter to her son-in-law has been so frequently quoted, gave up, during her lifetime, to her daughter Frances Todd, the greater part of the Irish property. The children of the above Frances and William Todd were, 1. Frances, married to Philip Boyer, esq. 2. Joanna, widow to major Hunt of the 12th dragoons, still living in 1819, and, at the age of ninety-five, in possession of all her faculties. 3. Mary Wray, married to Conway Jones, M.D., by whom she had, 1. William Todd Jones, of Homra, esq., representative for the borough of Lisburn, who died unmarried, at Rosstrevor, February 14, 1818, aged 63, in consequence of the

overturn of a carriage. Of his distinguished talents, and his intention, during the latter years of his life, to undertake that task which I have now imperfectly accomplished, I have already had occasion to take notice, as well as of the unfortunate fate which attended those family documents which, had they remained in his hands, might have furnished, from bishop Taylor's own pen, the best picture of his private character and history. 2. Edward Jones, esq., solicitor-general to the state of North Carolina, where he is now living, married, and with a numerous family. 3. Frances, married to Joseph Pollock, esq., by whom she had several children. 4. Mary, living unmarried. 5. Ann, married to lieut.-colonel John de Berniere, 18th regiment of foot; has a large family, and resides with a married daughter, near Charleston, in South Carolina. 5. Charlotte, widow of lieut.-colonel Henry Wray, of the Bengal establishment. 6. Catherine, married Robert Pepes Ormsby, esq., and died without issue in 1805.

Besides the above, I have met with several families in England and Ireland, who claim the honour of being descended from Jeremy Taylor. The families of French, Storey, and Sneyd, of the counties of Kildare and Cavan, are said to be connected with his line, through his daughter Mary; and a similar claim was advanced by the late Rev. Mr. Keate, rector of Laverton, in Somersetshire, father of the Rev. Dr. Keate, of Eton, on behalf of his mother, who was a

Lacey, and who is said to have preserved, with reverential care, a copy of the Ἐνιαυτος, which had been a present from the author to her father, who was, as she understood, his grandson. His grandsons, however, Jeremy Taylor, apparently, never saw, certainly not at such an age as would enable them to appreciate his presents. Nor had he any grandson of the name of Lacey. A great-grandson of that name he may have had, since the accounts of the Marsh family are so imperfect, and a family tradition of this kind is authority by no means to be despised: since, however inaccurate in some of its details, it must, in all probability, have had a foundation in truth. But the above tradition seems the only remaining ground for such a belief; at least I have been able to trace no other. A letter on the subject was written by Mr. Keate, to the Rev. Edward Jones, rector of Uppingham, who communicated it to Mr. Bonney; and I have myself made several inquiries of the late Thomas Keate, esq., of Chelsea Hospital, but without obtaining any additional information.

## NOTE (OO.)

The watch has been described as being "plain, and having only a single case, with a gold dial-plate, the figures of which are raised. The hands are of steel, and the maker's name is 'Jacobus Markwich, Londini.' Originally it had no chain, but went by means of catgut. Bishop Taylor caused a second

'case of copper to be made for it, covered with green velvet, and studded with gold. At the bottom, the studs are so arranged as to represent a mitre, surrounded by this motto, 'Nescitis horam.'" — BONNEY, p. 368.

NOTE (PP.)

"*Case of Lord Conway, Jeremy, Bishop of Down, and Moses Hill, Esq.*

"Monday, March 19, 1665-6.

"In answer to the petition of Moses Hill, esq., it is admitted, that the lands of Castlereagh, formerly belonging to Francis Hill, esq., who, by fine and other conveyance, did settle them on Randal, brother to the said Francis Hill, and the heirs male of his body, and, for default of such issue, on Edward Hill, the defendant's younger brother, and the heirs male of his body, and for default of such issue, on Arthur Hill, the defendant's father, and the heirs male of his body, who afterwards settled the same on the defendant, subject, notwithstanding, and liable to the lease made to the petitioner for seven years, to commence from the death of the said Arthur Hill.

"As to the bishop of Down's receiving his chief rent, due to him, out of part of the premises, the same was done by him in his politick capacity, and in right of his bishoprick, and was not any waver of his possession that he had of the said lands, as one of the said lessees thereof."

"The House agree with the paper."

" Saturday, April 14, 1666.

" Whereas, by order of this House, bearing date the 12th day of this instant April, the cause between the lord viscount Conway, and the lord bishop of Down, members of this House, and Moses Hill, esq., a member of the House of Commons, was this day appointed to be heard, and the time being so far elapsed, that this House could not now proceed to the hearing thereof; it is ordered, that the rents of the lands of Castlereagh, in the county of Down, and other lands now in question, and related to in the petition annexed, be sequestered and retained in the hands of the particular ter-tenants, until the further order of this House; and that the said rents be, and are hereby sequestered accordingly, and the Sheriff of the said county of Down is hereby required to see this order put in execution." — *Journals of the Irish House of Lords*, vol. i. p. 409.

This contest, in its progress, brought on a misunderstanding between the two Houses of Parliament, in which the Commons claimed the right of sitting at the conference. (*Journals*, vol. i. p. 442.) This, on a reference to the lord-lieutenant, was disallowed. It does not appear what became of the bishop's cause. It probably was not settled when the parliament was dissolved. The Bishop of Down appears to have been on various committees of the Lords. He, however, is mentioned two or three times as having obtained leave of absence. — For my knowledge of most of these particulars, I have to thank

the Hon. and Rev. J. C. Talbot, and the Rev. the Provost of Trinity College, Dublin.

NOTE (QQ.)

A frightful story of this kind is told of Edward I. of England. I wish it may be only the slander of enemies, whom he had grievously injured, and who were not unlikely to propagate, or believe, any evil of him.

" And when he to the death was near,
The folk that at Kyldrumy were,
Come with prisoners that they had tane;
And syne to the King are gane,
And, for to comfort him, they tauld,
How they the castell to them yauld;
And how they till his will were brought
To do of that whatever he thought;
And asked, ' what men should of them do?' —
Then look'd he angrily them to,
And said, grinning, ' Hang and draw !'
That was wonder of sic saw,
That he, that to the death was near,
Should answer upon sic maner,
Forouten moaning, and mercye. —
How might he trust on Him to cry
That dooms soothfastly all things,
To have mercye for his cryings,
Of him that, through his felonie,
Into sic point had no mercye?" — BARBOUR.

NOTE (RR.)

Taylor's appetite for the marvellous may seem to

have been sufficiently indiscriminate, when, in the same sentence, he refers, without the least apparent hesitation, to two such monstrous stories as those of the Egyptian Thebes, with its houses of alabaster, spotted with gold, and the city of Quinsay, with fourscore millions of inhabitants. It seems, however, to have been the common practice of writers in his time, to assume as facts, for the purposes of argument, any thing which suited their turn, and for which a single authority could be given. I know scarcely any instance in which they have appeared to distinguish between the weight of different testimonies, or to make any difference in their manner of citing circumstances alleged by writers of different ages. If a fact were found recorded in any ancient historian, they received it without question, how small soever the means of acquiring information which that historian may have possessed, or however great the internal evidence of his credulity or mendacity. In the present instance it never seems to have occurred to Taylor, either that the circumstances related by Clement and Pomponius Mela were, in themselves, impossible; or that both these writers were too modern to be much better acquainted with the antiquities of Thebes than we ourselves are. Nor did he apparently suspect, what is in all probability the case, a numerical error of Marco Polo's pen, or the pen of his editor, in the monstrous computation which he has given of the burghers of a

single city. For *millions*, it is plain we should read *myriads*, in which case the calculation will be perfectly sober and probable.

NOTE (SS)

" Two forms inseparable in unity
Hath Yamen; even as with hope or fear
The soul regardeth him, doth he appear.
For hope and fear,
At that dread hour, from ominous conscience spring,
And err not in their bodings.—Therefore some
(They who polluted with offences come,)
Behold him as the king
Of terrors, black of aspect, red of eye,
Reflecting back upon the sinful mind,
Heightened with vengeance and with wrath divine,
Its own inborn deformity.
But to the righteous spirit how benign
His awful countenance,
Where, tempering justice with parental love,
Goodness and heavenly grace,
And sweetest mercy shine! Yet is he still
Himself the same, one form, one face, one will,
And these his twofold aspects are but one;
And change is none
In him, for change in Yamen could not be:—
The Immutable is he!"—

*Curse of* Kehama, Canto xxiii.

NOTE (TT.)

" He [Henry More] had one heroine pupil. The lady Conway, formerly Mrs. Anne Finch, was of

incomparable parts and endowments, (there seems indeed a very great mixture of nobleness and ingenuity in the name and blood at this day.) Between this excellent person and the doctor, there was, from first to last, a very high friendship. He gives a great character of her in an epistle dedicatory, before his Antidote against Atheism. And I have heard him say, that he scarce ever met with any person, man or woman, of better natural parts than the lady Conway. She was mistress, as I must express it, of the highest theories, whether of philosophy or religion; and had, on all accounts, an extraordinary value and respect for the doctor."—"And as she always wrote a very clear style, so could she argue sometimes, or put to him the deepest and noblest queries imaginable.

"This *incomparable* person (as he was wont to call her) had the misfortune to be exercised from her very youth, with great pains and disorders in her head. Few have been afflicted in so severe and durable a manner as herself was; which yet she bore with admirable Christian patience and piety. Though it is not improbable but these so terrible fits, which oppressed and clouded her so much, might dispose her, by degrees, to a greater inclinableness bility the some persons, than her own free reason and pen, or the p for the doctor would otherwise have putation whichich yet he imputed to the height of her

virtue, and said, 'It was the greatness of her mind that betrayed her to it: who, looking upon some pretensions of the Quakers to be very excellent (and these imposing upon her judgment,) all the external considerations of her quality, and the world, availed nothing with her, for the hindering of those regards which she shewed towards them.'"—*Life of Dr. H. More*, by R. WARD, Lond. 1710, p. 192.

See also the character of this lady, published under the name of Van Helmont, but written by More, p. 203 of the same work.

The notices which follow, are from the correspondence of the lady's husband.—There are some among them which, with all our pity for the poor devout sufferer, will almost excite a smile.

"We have had thoughts oftentimes in my wife's sickness,—perhaps she may be breeding; but the excessive increase of her distemper, with many other reasons, so interrupted it, that they served only to torment."—"She hears that my Lord Chichester's former lady had got *an eagle's stone*, esteemed of great virtue in hard labour."—"Mr. Hill saw the stone, and hath another, but she prefers it, if it may be had. I would willingly be at the charge of an express messenger, rather than not get it with care and speed."—"My wife had one lent unto her that is much bigger, for she thinks the biggest is accounted the best, and, in pain, wore it

upon her arm a good while."—RAWDON *Papers*, pp. 191, 192, 194.

"At Ragley I met nothing but the sad condition of my wife, *whom I could not see, all the while I was there, though I stayed a fortnight.*"—p. 219.

"My wife is ill at present. Nobody hath seen her these ten days. *But I suppose it is much after the usual manner.*"—p. 241.

This sounds lamentable enough. But though the poor lady did not admit her husband to her apartment, she had abundance of other and more savoury company.

"In my family, all the women about my wife, and most of the rest, are Quakers, and Monsieur Van Helmont is the governour of that flock, an unpleasing sort of people, silent, sullen, and of a reserved conversation."—"These and *all of that society have free access* to my wife, but, I believe Dr. More, though he was in the house all the last summer, did not see her above twice or thrice"—*Ibid.* p. 254.

Of Mr. Greatrakes, and the reliance placed in him, enough has been already said, though many curious and additional circumstances may be found in the same interesting collection.

NOTE (U).

To understand the allusion of Athanasius, it is

necessary to observe that, in Habakkuk, ii. 11, the words which we render "the *beam* out of the timber," are in the LXX. translated "the *beetle* out of the timber:" κανθαρος ἐκ ξυλου. On which Athanasius thus observes, Διὰ τουτου εἰπεν ὁ μεγας προφητης ΚΑΙ ΚΑΝΘΑΡΟΣ ΕΚ ΞΥΛΟΥ ΦΘΕΞΕΤΑΙ. Ὁιδατε, ἀδελφοι, ὁτι ὁ κανθαρος περι τα ἀκαθαρτα σχολαζει, ἀκαθαρτος ὠν. Ουτως και ὁ λῃστης ποτε ἐσχολάσεν ἐν ταις ληστειαις. Οτε δὴ ἐν τω σταυρω ἠν ὡμολογησεν αὐτος, καθως προειπον, και πληρουται εἰς αυτον το προφητευθεν. De eo nimirum locutus est Propheta, *Et scarabeus è ligno vocem dabit.* Nostis, fratres, scarabeum ipsum immundum circa immunda negotiosum esse: ita quoque et hic latro negotiosus fuit in latrocinando; in cruce tamen confitetur, et in eo expletur quod prophetatum fuit." ATHANAS. *cont. Omnes Hæreses.* Op. tom. i. p. 1078. Ed. Colon.

Bernard's exhortation against covetousness, is as follows: "Utinam in duodecim (sc. clericis) unus hodie Petrus; unus qui reliquerit omnia, unus qui *loculis careat*, inveniatur. Unus, inquit [Christus,] ex vobis diabolus est.—A *duobus* itaque *bolis* diabolus dicitur, et Judas non loculum sed loculos habet."—GAUFRIDI *Declamationes ex S. Bernardi Sermonibus Collectæ.* BERNARD. Op. tom. ii. p. 304. Ed. Mabillone.

## NOTE (VV.)

These lines are adapted by Taylor to his purpose

from two passages in Prudentius. In the first, the poet is speaking of the fall and redemption of the world: in the second, of the plagues of Egypt.

"Stragem sed istam non tulit
Christus, cadentum *gentium*
Impunè, ne forsan sui
Patris periret fabrica."—CATHEM. *Hymn.* xi. 40.

"Quæ tandem poterit lingua retexere
Laudes, Christe, tuas, qui *domitam Pharon*,
*Plagis multimodis cedere præsuli*
*Cogis Justitiæ, vindice dextera.*"—*Ib. Hymn.* v. 83.

NOTE (WW.)

It is not often that Taylor borrows from contemporary writers; yet, from the singularity and aptness of the allusion, which was not likely to occur to two unconnected persons, I cannot help thinking that he has drawn the following passage of his second Sermon on the Ministerial Duties, from the Golden Remains of John Hales, as well as the work of Julius Agricola. Hales died in great poverty before the Restoration. In his Remains, published first in 1659, the same simile occurs (p. 35) in almost the same words, and the goblin labourers of whom he speaks, are represented at work in the vignette to the copperplate frontispiece.

"I remember that Agricola, in his book 'De Animalibus Subterraneis,' tells of a certain kind of spirits that use to converse in mines, and trouble the poor

labourers; they dig metals, they cleanse, they cast, they melt, they separate, they join the ore; but when they are gone, the men find just nothing done, not one step of their work set forward. So it is in the books and expositions of many men; they study, they argue, they expound, they confute, they reprove, they open secrets, and make new discoveries; and when you turn the bottom upwards, up starts nothing; no man is the wiser, no man is instructed, no truth discovered, no proposition cleared, nothing is altered, but that much labour and much time is lost; and this is manifest in nothing more than in books of controversy, and in mystical expositions of Scripture, 'Quærunt quod nusquam est, inveniunt tamen.'" Vol. vi. p. 516.

## NOTE (XX.)

The dedication is to the chief magistrates and senate of Hamburgh, in which, after complimenting them on their comparatively indulgent treatment of the Jews, the translator proceeds as follows:—

"Illustre tradit nobilissimus autor *Sadus* venerandæ antiquitatis exemplum, Abrahamum patriarcham, hospitalitatis gloriâ celebratum, vix sibi felix faustumque credidisse hospitium, nisi externum aliquem, tanquam aliquod præsidium domi, excepisset hospitem, quem omni officiorum genere coleret. Aliquando, cùm hospitem domi non haberet, foris eum quæsiturus campestria petiit. Fortè virum

quemdam, senectute gravem, itinere fessum, sub arbore recumbentem conspicit.

"Quem comiter exceptum, domum hospitem deducit, et omni officio colit. Cùm cœnam appositam Abrahamus et familia ejus à precibus auspicarentur, senex manum ad cibum protendit, nullo religionis aut pietatis auspicio usus. Quo viso, Abrahamus eum ita affatur: 'Mi senex, vix decet canitiem tuam sine prævia Numinis veneratione cibum sumere.' Ad quæ senex: 'Ego ignicola sum, istiusmodi morum ignarus; nostri enim majores nullam talem me docuere pietatem.' Ad quam vocem horrescens Abrahamus rem sibi cum ignicola profano et à sui Numinis cultu alieno esse, eum è vestigio et à cœna remotum, ut sui consortii pestem et religionis hostem, domo ejicit. Sed, ecce, Summus Deus Abrahamum statim monet: 'Quid agis, Abrahame? Itane viro fecisse te decuit? Ego isti seni, quantumvis in me usque ingrato, et vitam et victum centum amplius annos dedi; tu homini nec unam cœnam dare, unumque eum momentum ferre potes?' Quâ Divinâ voce monitus, Abrahamus senem ex itinere revocatum domum reducit, et tantis officiis, pietate, et ratione colit, ut suo exemplo ad veri Numinis cultum eum perduxerit."—G. GENTIUS, *Historia Judaica, Res Judæorum ab eversa Æde Hierosolymitana ad hæc ferè Tempora usque completæ.* Amstelodam. anno 1651.

The above work is a translation of the "Shebet

Jehuda," or "Rod of Judah," of R. Solomon Ben Virga, for an account of whom, see Bartolòcii Bibliotheca Rabbinica, p. 4. p. 575. The *Sadus*, from whom Gentius professes to have taken the story of Abraham, I once supposed to be Saadias Gaon, whose agnomen of "Gaon," the "Illustrious," agrees with the title which Gentius assigns to him.

The kindness of Lord Teignmouth has, however, pointed out to me the exact narrative, not in a Jewish, but a Persian writer, the celebrated poet Saadi, who gives it as *related to him*, he does not say by whom, in the second book of his Bostan. With the works of Saadi, Gentius was well acquainted, having himself published an edition of his Gulistan. Lord T. informs me that Saadi relates of himself, in this last work, that, having been taken prisoner by the Franks, he was compelled to work *with some Jews*, on the fortifications of Tripoli. And he suggests, therefore, that he may have possibly heard the story from them; so that it may, after all, have been originally derived from a Jewish source. A learned Jew also, Mr. J. D'Allemand, professes to have a strong impression on his mind that the tradition is to be met with, in all its circumstances, in one of the commentaries on Gen. xviii. 1. and on the words והוא ישב פתח האהל. No such commentary, however, has been discovered; and my friend, the Rev. Mr. Knatchbull, Fellow of All Souls', whose extensive acquaintance with every branch of Oriental

learning makes his opinion of the highest value, agrees with Mr. Oxlee in giving the credit of the story to Saadi. It is remarkable, too, that the "parable" does not occur in the first edition of the Liberty of Prophesying, published in 1647, and, therefore, before the work of Gentius appeared; but that it is added in the second edition, which came out six years after the "Historia Judaica." It is, therefore, most probable that Taylor found the story in Gentius; and that, by the common fate of those who quote at second hand, he ascribed to a Jew what his author had taken from a Persian.

The following is a translation of the passage in Saadi, which appeared in the Asiatic Miscellany, Calcutta, 1789; corrected, however, in one of its expressions, by the same distinguished person whose obliging assistance I have already acknowledged. The reader will, probably, be of opinion that, with whomsoever the praise of originality rests, the story has gained considerably in spirit and terseness in its progress, through Gentius, Taylor, and Franklin.

"I have heard that once, during a whole week, no traveller came to the hospitable dwelling of the friend of God; whose amiable nature led him to observe it as a rule, not to eat in the morning unless some needy person arrived from a journey. He went out and turned his eyes towards every place. He viewed the valley on all sides, and behold, in the desert, a solitary man resembling the willow, whose

'head and beard were whitened with the snow of age. To encourage him, he called him Friend, and, agreeably to the manners of the munificent, gave him an invitation, saying, 'O apple of mine eye, perform an act of courtesy by becoming my guest!' He assented, arose, and stepped forward readily, for he knew the kind disposition of his host, (on whom be peace!) The associates of Abraham's hospitable dwelling seated the old man with respect. The table was ordered to be spread, and the company placed themselves around. When the assembly began to utter 'In the name of God!' (or to say grace,) and not a word was heard to proceed from the old man, Abraham addressed him in such words as these -'O elder, stricken in years! thou appearest not to me in faith and zeal like other aged ones, for is it not an obligatory law to invoke, at the time of eating your daily meal, that divine Providence from whence it is derived?' He replied,—'I practise no rite which I have not heard from my priest, who worshippeth fire.' The good-omened prophet discovered this vitiated old man to be a Gueber, and, finding him an alien to the faith, drove him away in miserable plight, the polluted being rejected by those that are pure. A voice from the glorious and omnipotent God was heard, with this severe reprehension, —'O friend! I have supported him through a life of a hundred years, and thou hast conceived an abhorrence of him all at once! If a man pay adoration

to fire, shouldst thou withhold the hand of liberality?'"

NOTE (YY.)

These schoolmen are quoted by Aquinas, who, however, dissents from them. "Quidam dicunt quod primus homo non fuit creatus in gratia, sed tamen postmodum gratia fuit sibi collata antequam peccâsset. Plurimæ autem sanctorum auctoritates attestantur hominem in statu innocentiæ gratiam habuisse. Sed quod fuerit conditus in gratia, ut alii dicunt, videtur requirere ipsa rectitudo primi statûs, in qua Deus hominem fecit: secundum illud Ecclesiast. 7. Deus fecit hominem rectum."—S. THOM. AQUINAT. *Summa*, Pars 1. Quæst. 95. Art. i. p. 180.

NOTE (ZZ.)

If Mrs. Phillips thought fit to publish his papers, Taylor desires, in a postscript, "that they may be consigned into the hands of my worthy friend, *Dr. Wedderburne:* for I do not only expose all my sicknesses to his cure, but I submit my weaknesses to his censure; being as confident to find of him charity for what is pardonable as remedy for what is curable."——"And, as all that know him reckon him among the best physicians, so I know him worthy to be reckoned among the best friends."—Vol. xi. p. 335.

The person thus highly extolled by Taylor, is spoken of by Anthony Wood, as one of the physicians in ordinary to Charles the First, and a person of vast experience. He was originally a professor of philosophy at St. Andrew's; "but, that being too narrow a place for so great a person, he left it, travelled into various countries, and became so celebrated for his great skill in physic, that he was the chief man of this country for many years for that faculty. Afterwards he received the honour of knighthood, and was highly valued when he was in Holland with the prince, in 1646-7. At length, though his infirmities and great age forced him to retire from public practice and business, yet his fame contracts all the Scotch nation to him, and his noble hospitality and kindness to all that were learned and virtuous made his conversation no less loved than his advice was desired."

## NOTE (AAA.)

In stating the cases of intermarriage of kindred, Taylor appears to have been chiefly guided and sometimes misled by Grotius. He is wrong in supposing that very few learned men took the affirmative side as to the expediency and necessity of a divorce between Henry the Eighth and Queen Katherine. Burnet, on the contrary, observes, what is apparent from all contemporary history, that whatsoever King Henry's secret motives were, in the suit of his divorce,

he had the constant tradition of the church on his side, and that, in all the ages and parts of it, which was carefully searched into and fully proved; so that no author, older than Cardinal Cajetan, could be found to be set against such a current of tradition.

# INDEX.

*** *The Roman numerals refer to the volumes, and the Arabic figures to the pages.*


A

*Abraham* and the idolatrous traveller, origin of the story of, ii. 34, 35, 279 — 283.

*Advent* (Second) of Christ, sublime description of, by Bishop Taylor, i. 249, 250. Strong resemblance between it and a passage in Mr. Southey's 'Curse of Kehama,' 249; ii. 273.

*All Souls' College* (Oxford), Jeremy Taylor recommended to the fellows of, for a vacant fellowship, by Archbishop Laud, i. 20; ii. 189, 190. Who finally nominates him a fellow, by virtue of his visitorial powers, i. 21, 22. Copy of the nomination, ii. 191, 192.

*Allegorizing* of the Fathers, remarks on, i. 257, 258. Singular specimens of, ii. 277.

*Ancestors* of Bishop Taylor, notices of, i. 6, 7; ii. 185, 186.

'*Apology for Authorized and Set Forms of Liturgy*,' published by Bishop Taylor, i. 58.

*Aquinas* (Thomas), Specimen of the scholastic subtleties of, ii. 231 — 234, 284.

*Armorial Bearings* of Bishop Taylor, i. 8; ii. 187.

'*Artificial Handsomeness*,' the Treatise on, usually ascribed to Jeremy Taylor, proved not to be written by him, i. 86 — 96. Was probably written by Mrs. Katherine Philips, 99. Extracts from this treatise, ii. 220 — 226.

B

*Bridges* (Mrs. Joanna), a natural daughter of Prince (afterwards King) Charles I., married to Jeremy Taylor, i. 55.

C

*Carbery* (Sir Richard Vaughan, Earl of), notice of, i. 57; and of his family, ii. 205: patronizes Jeremy Taylor, i. 56.
*Carbery* (Frances, first Countess of), notice of, i. 57.
*Carbery* (Alice, second Countess of), notice of, i. 57.
*Charles I.* (King), joined by Jeremy Taylor, i. 31. Commands him to write his 'Episcopacy Asserted,' *ibid.* Issues a mandate for conferring the degree of D.D. on him, 32. Remonstrance of the heads of houses against the numerous degrees ordered by the king to be conferred, 32; ii. 194. A natural daughter of the king (when Prince of Wales) married by Jeremy Taylor, i. 55, 56. Taylor's last interview with the king, 41. Description of the watch given to him by the king, ii. 268, 269.
'*Christian Consolations*,' analysis of, with remarks, i. 251—255.
*Clergy*, notice of Bishop Taylor's Rules and Advices to, ii. 169.
*Confirmation*, analysis of Bishop Taylor's discourse on, with extracts and remarks, ii. 109—114.
*Conscience*, remarks on, ii. 139—141.
'*Contemplations on the State of Man*,' remarks on the style and composition of, with extracts, i. 244—250. On the appetite for the marvellous displayed in this treatise, ii. 271, 272
*Contracts*, observations on the fulfilment of, ii. 142.
*Conway* (Edward, Earl of,) patronizes and provides for Jeremy Taylor, i. 128, 129, 132; ii. 234—236.
*Cromwell* (Oliver), duplicity of his conduct towards the orthodox episcopal clergy, ii. 216—218. Why he oppressed them, i. 127, 128.

D

*Davenport* (John, alias Francis à Sancta Clara,) biographical notice of, i. 24—26. Remarks on Jeremy Taylor's friendship for him, 24—26. Archbishop Laud's account of his interview with him, ii. 193, 194.
'*Dissuasive from Popery*,' published by Bishop Taylor, i. 189.

Origin of, and motives to his undertaking this work, 189 — 197. Analysis of it, with extracts and remarks, ii. 88 — 108.

*Domestic Happiness*, beautiful reflections of Jeremy Taylor on, i. 103, 104.

*Drummond* (Rev. Dr. Hay), verses of, on Dr. Rowland Taylor, ii. 188.

'*Ductor Dubitantium*,' published by Jeremy Taylor, i. 154. Its comparative unpopularity accounted for, 155. Motives which probably induced him to undertake this treatise, ii. 129 — 133. Outline of its plan and contents, with extracts and remarks, 134 — 165. Observations on its style, 166, 167.

E

'*Episcopacy Asserted*,' this tract written by Jeremy Taylor at the request of King Charles I., i. 31. Analysis of it, with extracts and remarks, 291 — 304.

*Epitaph* of Bishop Nicholson, ii. 198, 199. Of Griffin Lloyd, 199. Of Mr. Justice Powell, 200, 201.

*Evelyn* (John, Esq.) patronizes Jeremy Taylor, i. 62, 63; ii. 211. Letters of, to Taylor, 205 — 210, 211 — 214. Letters to Evelyn by Bishop Taylor, i. 72, 73, 76, — 79, 82 — 84, 86, 87, 88, 90 — 92, 100, 106, 108, 109 — 114, 124 — 127, 129 — 131, 135 — 137, 139 — 143, 147 — 149, 151 — 153, 174, 175. Procures his liberation from the Tower, i. 123; ii. 228 — 230. Remarks on the termination of their correspondence, i. 176.

*Felicity of the Saints*, Bishop Taylor's sentiments on, i. 110 — 114. Remarks thereon, 114 — 118.

*Finch* (Francis, Esq.), biographical notice of, ii. 227.

*Finch* (Lady Anne,) biographical notice of, i. 250; ii. 274 — 276.

*Friendship*, analysis of Bishop Taylor's treatise on, with extracts and remarks, ii. 115 — 123.

*Francis à Sanctâ Clarâ*. See *Davenport* (John).

G

*Ghosts*, account of supposed appearances of, i. 178 — 180; ii. 245 — 258.

'*Golden Grove*,' analysis of, with remarks, ii. 169—173.
'*Great Exemplar*.' See '*Life of Christ*.'
*Gunpowder Treason*, remarks on Bishop Taylor's sermon on, i. 29, 30, 260 — 272.

H

*Harrison* (Edward, son-in-law of Bishop Taylor), ii. 264. Notices of his children, Michael Harrison, *ibid.* Jeremiah Taylor Harrison, 264, 265. Francis Harrison, 266. Marsh Harrison, 265, 266. Mary Harrison, and her descendants, 266.
*Hatton* (Christopher, Esq.), patronizes Jeremy Taylor, i. 33. Remarks on his character, 34; ii. 195, 196.
'*Holy Living*,' analysis of Bishop Taylor's treatise on, i. 228—233. Remarks on some of the prayers contained in it, 233 — 236. Five rules for reading this treatise to advantage, 224 — 227.
'*Holy Dying*,' extracts from Bishop Taylor's dedication of, i. 236—238. Observations on its style, 242, 243.
*Hunter* (David), account of the supposed appearance of a ghost to, i. 179; ii. 252—255.
*Hymns* of Bishop Taylor, specimens of, with remarks, ii. 171 — 173.

I

*Immortality of the Soul*, why not insisted upon by St. Paul, in his discourse to the Athenians, i. 113.
*Intermarriages of kindred*, mistake of Bishop Taylor concerning, corrected, ii. 285, 286.
*Ireland*, miserable state of, in 1664, i. 189—194.
*Jeanes*, (Henry), biographical notice of, i. 119. Account of his controversy with Jeremy Taylor, on the subject of Original Sin, 109 — 121.
*Jones* (William Todd, Esq.), biographical notice of, i. 3; ii. 266, 267. Notice of his collections for a Life of Bishop Taylor, i. 4.

L

*Langsdale* (Phœbe), married to Jeremy Taylor, i. 30. Her children, 31.
*Langsdale* (Dr.), Letter of Bishop Taylor to, i. 35, 36.
*Laud* (William, Archbishop of Canterbury), patronizes Jeremy Taylor, i. 17 — 19. Recommends him to be chosen Fellow of

All Souls' College, Oxford, 20; ii. 189, 190. And finally nominates him, as the Visitor of that College, i. 21, 22. Copy of the Archbishop's nomination, ii. 191, 192. Laud's account of his interviews with Friar John Davenport, ii. 193, 194.

*Laws* (Human), Observations on the Interpretation of, ii. 151—164.

*Letters* from Bishop Taylor to Dr. Langsdale, i. 35. To John Evelyn, 72, 73, 76—79, 82—84, 86, 87, 88, 90—92, 100, 106, 108, 109—114, 124—127, 129—131, 135—137, 139—143, 147—149, 151—153, 174, 175. To Bishop Warner, i. 69—71. To Dr. Sheldon, 80, 81. To Professor Stearne, 146, 147. Of Archbishop Laud, ii. 189, 190. Of John Evelyn to Bishop Taylor, ii. 205—207, 211—214. And to the Lieutenant of the Tower in behalf of Taylor, 228—230.

'*Liberty of Prophesying*,' published by Jeremy Taylor, i. 43. Remarks thereon, 44, 45. This treatise attacked by Samuel Rutherford, 45, 46; ii. 203. Bishop Taylor's motives in writing it vindicated from the unjust censures of Mr. Orme, i. 49—54. Analysis of this treatise, with extracts and remarks, ii. 20—47.

'*Life of Christ, or the great Exemplar*,' publication of, i. 58. Remarks on its triple dedications, 58—60. Remarks on its design, plan, and execution, 208—222. It is not a translation from the Latin Harmony of Ludolphus de Saxoniâ, 223. On its style, 224.

*Liturgy*, Bishop Taylor's Apology for Authorized and Set Forms of, published, i. 58. Analysis of it, with extracts and remarks, ii. 1—20.

*Lloyd* (Griffin, Esq.), a pupil of Bishops Taylor and Nicholson, i. 42. Epitaph on, ii. 199.

*Ludolphus de Saxoniâ*, notice of the Harmony of, i. 223.

M

*Marsh* (Dr. Francis, Archbishop of Dublin), marries a daughter of Bishop Taylor, i. 199. Notice of some of his descendants, ii. 261.

*Marsh* (Rev. Digby), character of, ii. 261—264.

*Mather* (Increase), animadversions of, on Bishop Taylor's propounding certain questions to be asked of a supposed ghost, ii. 255—257.

*Milton*, diatribe of, against the enemies of liberty of conscience, ii. 202.

*Ministerial Duty and Doctrine*, remarks on Bishop Taylor's two discourses on, i. 280—290. A passage in them probably drawn from the 'Golden Remains' of John Hales, ii. 278, 279 Notice of his 'Divine Institution and Necessity of the Office Ministerial,' ii. 167, 168. And of his 'Rules and Advices to the Clergy,' 169.

N

*Nicholson*, (William, Bishop of Gloucester), keeps school jointly with Jeremy Taylor, i. 42. Biographical notice of him, ii. 197, 198. Bishop Bull's epitaph on him, 198, 199.

O

*Offices*, remarks on Bishop Taylor's collection of, ii. 173, 171.

*Original Sin*, Bishop Taylor's observations on, analyzed, with remarks, ii. 53—68.

*Orme* (Mr.), censures of, on Bishop Taylor's 'Liberty of Prophesying,' examined and refuted, i. 49—54.

P

*Perfectionists*, notice of the sect of, i. 136; ii. 236.

*Philips* (Mrs. Catharine), the probable author of the treatise on 'Artificial Handsomeness', i. 99. Extracts from it, ii. 220—226. Notice of her, i. 122.

*Piers*, or *Pierce* (Thomas), biographical notice of, ii. 239

*Powell* (Sir John) a pupil of Bishops Taylor and Nicholson i. 42. His Epitaph, ii. 200—202.

*Preachers*, remarks on the defective style and composition of, in the time of Bishop Taylor, i. 257—259.

*Presbyterians*, disingenuous conduct of, at the restoration, exposed, ii. 241—244.

R

'*Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist*,' analysis of this treatise of Bishop Taylor's, ii. 69—83. Observations on its style, 84—87.

*Repentance*, analysis of Bishop Taylor's treatise on the doctrine of, with extracts and remarks, ii. 48—69

*Rust* (Doctor George, afterwards Bishop of Dromore), invited to Ireland by Bishop Taylor, i. 177. Whose funeral sermon he preaches, 198.

*Rutherford*, (Samuel), attacks Jeremy Taylor's 'Liberty of Prophesying,' i. 45, 46. Notice of his extraordinary defence of persecution, ii. 203, 204.

S

*Sermons*, remarks on the defective style and composition of, prevalent in the time of Bishop Taylor, i. 257 — 259. Critical remarks on his sermon on the Gunpowder Treason, 260 — 272. On his sermons on the Minister's Duty in Life and Doctrine, 280 — 290. And on his other sermons, 272 — 280.

*Sizars*, remarks on the situation of, at Cambridge, i. 11 — 15.

*Stearne* (Dr. John), Letter of Dr. Taylor to, i. 146, 147. Appointed a Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, 159.

T

*Turcrner* (Francis), account of the supposed appearance of an apparition to, i. 178, 179; ii. 245 — 252.

*Taylor* (Jeremy), Biographical notices of the ancestors of, i. 6, 7; ii 185, 186. The family arms of, i. 8; ii. 187. Baptismal register of his family, 185, 186. His birth, i. 6; ii. 186. His early education, i. 11. Admitted a sizar at Caius College, Cambridge, *ibid.* ii. 138. Remarks on his studies there, i. 11 — 16. Takes holy orders, 17. Preaches at St. Paul's, *ibid.* And at Lambeth, before Archbishop Laud, who patronizes him, 17 — 19. Is admitted Master of Arts of University College, Oxford, 19, 20. Is recommended by Archbishop Laud to be chosen Fellow of All Souls' College, 20; ii. 189, 190. But was nominated by the Archbishop, as Visitor of the College, i. 21, 22; ii. 191; and admitted Fellow, 192. Appointed Rector of Uppingham, i. 23. Remarks on his acquaintance with Francis à Sanctâ Clarâ (John Davenport), 24 — 26. Marries Phœbe Langsdale, 30. His children by her, 31. Writes his 'Episcopacy Asserted,' at the request of King Charles I., *ibid.*; by whose mandate he is created D.D., 32. Jeremy Taylor ejected from his rectory by the presbyterians, 32. Patronized by Christopher Hatton, Esq., 33. His pecuniary difficulties during the civil wars, 35, ii. 195. Is taken prisoner

by the parliamentary troops in Wales, i. 37. Publishes 'Psalter of David, with Titles and Collects,' 39; ii. 196. Is leased from captivity, i. 40, 41. Takes leave of King Charles I., 41. Keeps a school for his support, with William Nicholson (afterwards bishop of Gloucester), and William Wyat, 42. Writes a dedication to Wyat's 'New and Easy Institution of Grammar,' 43. Publishes his 'Liberty of Prophesying,' 43, 44; which is attacked by Samuel Rutherford, 45, 46; ii. 203. Vindication of Taylor from the unjust censures of Mr. Orme, i. 49—54. Marriage of Jeremy Taylor with a natural daughter of Prince Charles (afterwards King Charles I.), 55. He is patronized by the Earl of Carbery, 56. Publishes the 'Apology for Authorized and Set Forms of Liturgy,' 58; and his 'Life of Christ,' *ibid.* Publishes Sermons and other Tracts, 60, 61. Is a second time imprisoned, 62; and, it should seem, a third time, 63; ii. 211 — 214. Remarks on this imprisonment i. 64, 65. Completes his Sermons, and publishes his 'Unum Necessarium,' or, Treatise on Repentance, 66; which is attacked by various persons, 67. His Letter to Bishop Warner, 69—71. Is liberated from prison, 71; and visits London, ii. 211. i. 81; ii. 216, 219. Returns to Wales, i. 85; and publishes his 'Deus Justificatus,' 85. The Treatise on 'Artificial Handsomeness,' not written by Taylor, 86—96. Reflections of Dr. Taylor on the death of two of his children, 100, 101. Revisits London, and shews the manuscript of his 'Ductor Dubitantium' to Mr. Evelyn, 105; ii. 227. Account of Taylor's Controversy with Henry Jeanes on the doctrine of Original Sin, i. 119—121. Republishes several of his former pieces, with the addition of an Essay on Friendship, 121, 122. Is imprisoned in the Tower of London, 123; but liberated through the influence of Evelyn, *ibid.* ii. 228—230. Consoles Evelyn on the death of two sons, i. 124 — 127. Is patronized and provided for by Edward, Earl of Conway, i. 128, 129, 132; ii. 234—236. Settles in Ireland, i. 133, 134; where he is falsely denounced to the Privy Council, i. 138; ii. 236, 237; and summoned to Dublin, i. 143, 144; ii. 240. Calumniated, as being disposed to return to popery, i. 145. Revisits London, and signs a Declaration of Loyalty to Charles II., i. 153, 154. Publishes the 'Ductor Dubitantium,' 154; and

some other pieces, 156. Nominated Bishop of Down and Connor, 157. Elected Vice-chancellor of the University of Dublin, 158. His labours there, 158; and in his diocese, 159, 160. Remarks on the ecclesiastical measures adopted in Ireland, 160—165. Consecration of Bishop Taylor, 166. The administration of the see of Dromore confided to him, 166. Zealous efforts of Taylor to reconcile the Covenanters, *ibid.* His success in bringing over to the Church the nobility and gentry of the three dioceses, 167. Remarks on his conduct at this crisis, and on his Sermon before the Irish Parliament 168 — 174. Termination of his friendship with Evelyn, 176. Munificence of Bishop Taylor and his Lady to the Cathedral Church of Dromore, i. 177; ii. 244, 245. Publishes his 'Via Intelligentiæ,' i. 180; also his Χριστος Τελειωτης, a Discourse on Confirmation, 189; and his 'Dissuasive from Popery,' *ibid.* Personal and domestic afflictions of Bishop Taylor, i. 197, 198; ii. 259. His death, i. 198. Description of his person, 200—202. Notices of some of his descendants, i. 199, 200; ii. 261—268. His amiable character, i. 202—204. His munificent charity, 205. Description of the watch given by Charles I. to Bishop Taylor, ii. 268, 269. Notice of a law-suit in which Bishop Taylor was engaged towards the close of his life, i. 205; ii. 269—271. Classification of his works, i. 206, 207. Analysis of his practical works, with remarks, i. 208—290. Of his theological works, 290—304; ii. 1—114. Of his casuistical works, 115—167; and of his devotional works, 167—174. General estimate of the literary character of Bishop Taylor, 175—184.

*Taylor* (Dr. Rowland), a martyr for the Protestant religion, biographical notices of, i. 6, 7; ii. 187. Poetical inscription to his memory, 188. His character, i. 9, 10.

*Taylor* (Charles, third son of Bishop Taylor), notice of, i. 197, 198.

*Taylor* (Joanna, daughter of Bishop Taylor), notices of, and of her descendants, ii. 264—266.

*Thorndike* (Herbert), notice of, ii. 239.

*Transubstantiation*, the Romish doctrine of, not found in Scripture, ii. 73—82. When introduced by the Romish church, as an article of faith, 82, 83.

U

'*Unum Necessarium*;' or, Treatise on Repentance, publication of, i. 66. It is attacked by various persons, 67, 68. Correspondence of Jeremy Taylor on this subject, 69—71. Analysis of this treatise, with extracts and remarks, ii. 48—69.

*Uppingham*, rectory of, conferred on Jeremy Taylor, i. 23. Sequestered from him by the presbyterians, 32; without any part of the emoluments being given to him, 33.

V

*Vaughan* (Sir Richard), See *Carbery*.

'*Via Intelligentiæ*,' a Sermon, published by Bishop Taylor, i. 180. Remarks thereon, with extracts, 181—188.

*Werner* (John, Bishop of Rochester), correspondence of Jeremy Taylor with, on the subject of his 'Unum Necessarium,' i. 69—71.

*Watch* given by King Charles I. to Bishop Taylor, description of, ii. 268, 269.

*Wedderburne* (Dr.), eulogized by Taylor, ii. 284. Biographical notice of, 285.

'*Worthy Communicant*' of Bishop Taylor, notice of, ii. 174, 175.

*Wyat* (William) keeps school jointly with Bishop Taylor, i. 19, who writes a Dedication to his 'New and Easy Institution of Latin Grammar,' 43. Biographical notice of him, ii. 199, 200.

THE END.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY J. MOYES, GREVILLE STREET.